NORTH AMERICAN REVIEW

No. DCVIII.

FEBRUARY 1, 1907.

CHAPTERS FROM MY AUTOBIOGRAPHY.—XI.*

BY MARK TWAIN.

PREFATORY NOTE.—Mr. Clemens began to write his autobiography many years ago, and he continues to add to it day by day. It was his original intention to permit no publication of his memoirs until after his death; but, after leaving "Pier No. 70," he concluded that a considerable portion might now suitably be given to the public. It is that portion, garnered from the quarter-million of words already written, which will appear in this REVIEW during the coming year. No part of the autobiography will be published in book form during the lifetime of the author.—EDITOR N. A. R.

[*Dictated March 28th, 1906.*] About 1849 or 1850 Orion severed his connection with the printing-house in St. Louis and came up to Hannibal, and bought a weekly paper called the Hannibal "Journal," together with its plant and its good-will, for the sum of five hundred dollars cash. He borrowed the cash at ten per cent. interest, from an old farmer named Johnson who lived five miles out of town. Then he reduced the subscription price of the paper from two dollars to one dollar. He reduced the rates for advertising

(1850.)

*Copyright, 1906, by HARPER & BROTHERS. All Rights Reserved.

Copyright, 1907, by THE NORTH AMERICAN REVIEW PUBLISHING COMPANY. All Rights Reserved

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

in about the same proportion, and thus he created one absolute and unassailable certainty—to wit: that the business would never pay him a single cent of profit. He took [redacted] of the "Courier" office and engaged my services in his own at three dollars and a half a week, which was an extravagant wage, but Orion was always generous, always liberal with everybody except himself. It cost him nothing in my case, for he never was able to pay me a penny as long as I was with him. By the end of the first year he found he must make some economies. The office rent was cheap, but it was not cheap enough. He could not afford to pay rent of any kind, so he moved the whole plant into the house we lived in, and it cramped the dwelling-place cruelly. He kept that paper alive during four years, but I have at this time no idea how he accomplished it. Toward the end of each year he had to turn out and scrape and scratch for the fifty dollars of interest due Mr. Johnson, and that fifty dollars was about the only cash he ever received or paid out, I suppose, while he was proprietor of that newspaper, except for ink and printing-paper. The paper was a dead failure. It had to be that from the start. Finally he handed it over to Mr. Johnson, and went up to Muscatine, Iowa, and acquired a small interest in a weekly newspaper there. It was not a sort of property to marry on—but no matter. He came across a winning and pretty girl who lived in Quincy, Illinois, a few miles below Keokuk, and they became engaged. He was always falling in love with girls, but by some accident or other he had never gone so far as engagement before. And now he achieved nothing but misfortune by it, because he straightway fell in love with a Keokuk girl. He married the Keokuk girl and they began a struggle for life which turned out to be a difficult enterprise, and very unpromising.

To gain a living in Muscatine was plainly impossible, so Orion and his new wife went to Keokuk to live, for she wanted to be near her relatives. He bought a little bit of a job-printing plant—on credit, of course—and at once put prices down to where not even the apprentices could get a living out of it, and this sort of thing went on.

I had not joined the Muscatine migration. Just before that happened (which I think was in 1853) I disappeared one night and fled to St. Louis. There I worked in the

(1853.)

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

composing-room of the "Evening News" for a time, and then started on my travels to see the world. The world was New York City, and there was a little World's Fair there. It had just been opened where the great reservoir afterward was, and where the sumptuous public library is now being built—Fifth Avenue and Forty-second Street. I arrived in New York with two or three dollars in pocket change and a ten-dollar bank-bill concealed in the lining of my coat. I got work at villainous wages in the establishment of John A. Gray and Green in Cliff Street, and I found board in a sufficiently villainous mechanics' boarding-house in Duane Street. The firm paid my wages in wildcat money at its face value, and my week's wage merely sufficed to pay board and lodging. By and by I went to Philadelphia and worked there some months as a "sub" on the "Inquirer" and the "Public Ledger." Finally I made a flying trip to Wash-

(1854.) ington to see the sights there, and in 1854 I went back to the Mississippi Valley, sitting upright in the smoking-car two or three days and nights. When I reached St. Louis I was exhausted. I went to bed on board a steamboat that was bound for Muscatine. I fell asleep at once, with my clothes on, and didn't wake again for thirty-six hours.

. . . I worked in that little job-office in Keokuk as much as two years, I should say, without ever collecting a cent of wages, for Orion was never able to pay anything—but Dick Higham and I had good times. I don't know what Dick got, but it was probably only uncashable promises.

One day in the midwinter of 1856 or 1857—I think it was 1856—I was coming along the main street of Keokuk in the

(1856.) middle of the forenoon. It was bitter weather — so bitter that that street was deserted, almost. A light dry snow was blowing here and there on the ground and on the pavement, swirling this way and that way and making all sorts of beautiful figures, but very chilly to look at. The wind blew a piece of paper past me and it lodged against a wall of a house. Something about the look of it attracted my attention and I gathered it in. It was a fifty-dollar bill, the only one I had ever seen, and the largest assemblage of money I had ever encountered in one spot. I advertised it in the papers and suffered more than a thousand dollars' worth of solicitude and fear and distress during the next few days lest the owner should see the advertisement

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

and come and take my fortune away. As many as four days went by without an applicant; then I could endure this kind of misery no longer. I felt sure that another four could not go by in this safe and secure way. I felt that I must take that money out of danger. So I bought a ticket for Cincinnati and went to that city. I worked there several months in the printing-office of Wrightson and Company. I had been reading Lieutenant Herndon's account of his explorations of the Amazon and had been mightily attracted by what he said of coca. I made up my mind that I would go to the head waters of the Amazon and collect coca and trade in it and make a fortune. I left for New Orleans in the steamer "Paul Jones" with this great idea filling my mind. One of the pilots of that boat was Horace Bixby. Little by little I got acquainted with him, and pretty soon I was doing a lot of steering for him in his daylight watches. When I got to New Orleans I inquired about ships leaving for Pará and discovered that there weren't any, and learned that there probably wouldn't be any during that century. It had not occurred to me to inquire about these particulars before leaving Cincinnati, so there I was. I couldn't get to the Amazon. I had no friends in New Orleans and no money to speak of. I went to Horace Bixby and asked him to make a pilot out of me. He said he would do it for a hundred dollars cash in advance. So I steered for him up to St. Louis, borrowed the money from my brother-in-law and closed the bargain. I had acquired this brother-in-law several years before. This was Mr. William A. Moffett, a merchant, a Virginian—a fine man in every way. He had married my sister Pamela, and the Samuel E. Moffett of whom I have been speaking was their son. Within eighteen months I became a competent pilot, and I served that office until the Mississippi River traffic was brought to a standstill by the breaking out of the civil war.

. . . Meantime Orion had gone down the river and established his little job-printing-office in Keokuk. On account of charging next to nothing for the work done in his job-office, he had almost nothing to do there. He was never able to comprehend that work done on a profitless basis deteriorates and is presently not worth anything, and that customers are then obliged to go where they can get better work, even if they must pay better prices for it. He had plenty of time, and he took up Blackstone again.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

He also put up a sign which offered his services to the public as a lawyer. He never got a case, in those days, nor even an applicant, although he was quite willing to transact law business for nothing and furnish the stationery himself. He was always liberal that way.

Presently he moved to a wee little hamlet called Alexandria, two or three miles down the river, and he put up that sign there. He got no custom. He was by this time very hard aground. But by this time I was beginning to earn a wage of two hundred and fifty dollars a month as pilot, and so I supported him thenceforth until 1861, when his ancient friend, Edward Bates, then a member of Mr. Lincoln's first cabinet, got him the place of Secretary of the new Territory of Nevada, and Orion and I cleared for that country in the overland stage-coach, I paying the fares, which were pretty heavy, and carrying with me what money I had been able to save—this was eight hundred dollars, I should say—and it was all in silver coin and a good deal of a nuisance because of its weight. And we had another nuisance, which was an Unabridged Dictionary. It weighed about a thousand pounds, and was a ruinous expense, because the stage-coach Company charged for extra baggage by the ounce. We could have kept a family for a time on what that dictionary cost in the way of extra freight—and it wasn't a good dictionary anyway—didn't have any modern words in it—only had obsolete ones that they used to use when Noah Webster was a child.

(1861.)

The Government of the new Territory of Nevada was an interesting menagerie. Governor Nye was an old and seasoned politician from New York—politician, not statesman. He had white hair; he was in fine physical condition; he had a winningly friendly face and deep lustrous brown eyes that could talk as a native language the tongue of every feeling, every passion, every emotion. His eyes could outtalk his tongue, and this is saying a good deal, for he was a very remarkable talker, both in private and on the stump. He was a shrewd man; he generally saw through surfaces and perceived what was going on inside without being suspected of having an eye on the matter.

When grown-up persons indulge in practical jokes, the fact gauges them. They have lived narrow, obscure, and ignorant lives, and at full manhood they still retain and cherish a job-lot of left-over standards and ideals that would have been discarded

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

with their boyhood if they had then moved out into the world and a broader life. There were many practical jokers in the new Territory. I do not take pleasure in exposing this fact, for I liked those people; but what I am saying is true. I wish I could say a kindlier thing about them instead — that they were burglars, or hat-rack thieves, or something like that, that wouldn't be utterly uncomplimentary. I would prefer it, but I can't say those things, they would not be true. These people were practical jokers, and I will not try to disguise it. In other respects they were plenty good-enough people; honest people; reputable and likable. They played practical jokes upon each other with success, and got the admiration and applause and also the envy of the rest of the community. Naturally they were eager to try their arts on big game, and that was what the Governor was. But they were not able to score. They made several efforts, but the Governor defeated these efforts without any trouble and went on smiling his pleasant smile as if nothing had happened. Finally the joker chiefs of Carson City and Virginia City conspired together to see if their combined talent couldn't win a victory, for the jokers were getting into a very uncomfortable place: the people were laughing at them, instead of at their proposed victim. They banded themselves together to the number of ten and invited the Governor to what was a most extraordinary attention in those days—pickled oyster stew, and champagne—luxuries very seldom seen in that region, and existing rather as fabrics of the imagination than as facts.

The Governor took me with him. He said disparagingly,

"It's a poor invention. It doesn't deceive. Their idea is to get me drunk and leave me under the table, and from their standpoint this will be very funny. But they don't know me. I am familiar with champagne and have no prejudices against it."

The fate of the joke was not decided until two o'clock in the morning. At that hour the Governor was serene, genial, comfortable, contented, happy and sober, although he was so full that he couldn't laugh without shedding champagne tears. Also, at that hour the last joker joined his comrades under the table, drunk to the last perfection. The Governor remarked,

"This is a dry place, Sam, let's go and get something to drink and go to bed."

The Governor's official menagerie had been drawn from the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

humblest ranks of his constituents at home—harmless good fellows who had helped in his campaigns, and now they had their reward in petty salaries payable in greenbacks that were worth next to nothing. Those boys had a hard time to make both ends meet. Orion's salary was eighteen hundred dollars a year, and he couldn't even support his dictionary on it. But the Irishwoman who had come out on the Governor's staff charged the menagerie only ten dollars a week apiece for board and lodging. Orion and I were of her boarders and lodgers; and so, on these cheap terms the silver I had brought from home held out very well.

('62 or '63.) At first I roamed about the country seeking silver, but at the end of '62 or the beginning of '63 when I came up from Aurora to begin a journalistic life on the Virginia City "Enterprise," I was presently sent down to Carson City to report the legislative session. Orion was soon very popular with the members of the legislature, because they found that whereas they couldn't usually trust each other, nor anybody else, they could trust him. He easily held the belt for honesty in that country, but it didn't do him any good in a pecuniary way, because he had no talent for either persuading or scaring legislators. But I was differently situated. I was there every day in the legislature to distribute compliment and censure with evenly balanced justice and spread the same over half a page of the "Enterprise" every morning, consequently I was an influence. I got the legislature to pass a wise and very necessary law requiring every corporation doing business in the Territory to record its charter in full, without skipping a word, in a record to be kept by the Secretary of the Territory—my brother. All the charters were framed in exactly the same words. For this record-service he was authorized to charge forty cents a folio of one hundred words for making the record; also five dollars for furnishing a certificate of each record, and so on. Everybody had a toll-road franchise but no toll-road. But the franchise had to be recorded and paid for. Everybody was a mining corporation, and had to have himself recorded and pay for it. Very well, we prospered. The record-service paid an average of a thousand dollars a month, in gold.

Governor Nye was often absent from the Territory. He liked to run down to San Francisco every little while and enjoy a rest from Territorial civilization. Nobody complained, for he was

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

prodigiously popular. He had been a stage-driver in his early days in New York or New England, and had acquired the habit of remembering names and faces, and of making himself agreeable to his passengers. As a politician this had been valuable to him, and he kept his arts in good condition by practice. By the time he had been Governor a year, he had shaken hands with every human being in the Territory of Nevada, and after that he always knew these people instantly at sight and could call them by name. The whole population, of 20,000 persons, were his personal friends, and he could do anything he chose to do and count upon their being contented with it. Whenever he was absent from the Territory—which was generally—Orion served his office in his place, as Acting Governor, a title which was soon and easily shortened to "Governor." He recklessly built and furnished a house at a cost of twelve thousand dollars, and there was no other house in the sage-brush capital that could approach this property for style and cost.

When Governor Nye's four-year term was drawing to a close, the mystery of why he had ever consented to leave the great State of New York and help inhabit that jack-rabbit desert was solved: he had gone out there in order to become a United States Senator. All that was now necessary was to turn the Territory into a State. He did it without any difficulty. That undeveloped country and that sparse population were not well fitted for the heavy burden of a State Government, but no matter, the people were willing to have the change, and so the Governor's game was made.

Orion's game was made too, apparently, for he was as popular because of his honesty as the Governor was for more substantial reasons; but at the critical moment the inborn capriciousness of his character rose up without warning, and disaster followed.

MARK TWAIN.

(To be Continued.)

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE PONTIFICATE OF PIUS X

BY THE MOST REV. JOHN IRELAND, ARCHBISHOP OF ST. PAUL.

THE brief review which I propose to give of the three and a half years of the pontificate of Pius X is intended in the main as a reply to an article in the January 4th REVIEW, signed "A Catholic Priest." In its treatment of its theme, it will follow largely upon the lines chosen by the writer of that article.

The writer should not have veiled his personality under the anonym, "A Catholic Priest." Anonymity is not always censurable; but it is decidedly censurable when it involves in its contentions others than the writer. Here a whole class is brought upon the scene, the whole priesthood of the Catholic Church. Naturally, the reader remarks to himself: If the author of this article is a member in good standing of the Catholic priesthood, if opinions such as his are auth rized, or even tolerated, within its ranks, a novel and ominous situation is created for the Church, which at once is made to face an era of disintegration, disciplinary and even doctrinal. "A Catholic Priest" should have signed his name to his article; the reader, then, would have known what value to put on his words, what conclusions to draw from his paragraphs, one more startling than the other, all going to prove that the Papacy is properly characterized by Carlyle, as personified "finesse, chicanery, hypocrisy, false or foul dealing"; that the best of men, a very saint, ascending the throne of Peter, "New Testament in hand," becomes ensnared in its meshes and is plied beyond recovery into its worldliness of spirit and perversity of method of action.

I must note the manner of argument to which "A Catholic Priest" is so ready to resort—generalizations to bewilder *a priori* the fancy of the unreflecting reader, cumulative charges of crime and infamy, unsupported by facts, to prejudice his judgment.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Here it is: "The abominable traditions that have disgraced the Roman See"; "the bigotry, cruelty, hatred of truth and defiance of civilization which characterize the Papacy at this hour"; "the gigantic fabric of centuries of Papal traditions with their secular aims, their aristocratic pride, their immovable stubbornness and their theocratic pretensions." This manner of argument denotes excitement and passion: instead of leading to conviction, it should put us on our guard. It is not the calm voice of logic or history; it is bluster and swagger to conjure with before the crowd. It is unworthy of the writer in whom we are invited to see a serious searcher of truth; it is unworthy of the theme which "A Catholic Priest" has in hand—the Papacy. Let critics belabor the Papacy as they will: when all has been said, the Papacy is still the loftiest embodiment of moral grandeur and beneficent well-doing pictured upon the pages of the story of humanity; even in criticism, it should be treated with respect and reverence.

"Pius X entered upon his pontificate with the New Testament in his hand. . . . Of the New Testament spirit there is none, under the present régime, at Rome."

The charge, as formulated by "A Catholic Priest," is not altogether and exclusively his own. It comes from pens of others—notably from Fogazzaro in the well-known volume *"Il Santo,"* with this difference, however, that, far different from "A Catholic Priest," Fogazzaro is dignified and respectful, equally so when he blames the Papacy as when he praises it.

Pius X entered upon his Pontificate "with the New Testament in his hand." He chose for his motto the words of St. Paul, *"Restaurare omnia in Christo"*—to renew all things in Christ. And Pius X has not departed from the spirit of his motto; he has not allowed the New Testament to drop from hand or mind.

The New Testament is Christ speaking and doing, nineteen hundred years ago, in Palestine; the Christian, chieftain or subject, must hold it as his rule of life, and breathe into his acts the lessons and the spirit of its teachings. But it needs to be properly understood; its lessons need to be properly applied.

The words of Christ in the New Testament are vital principles of religion and ethics — ever unchangeable as truths, yet ever changeable in form of practical application, as are changeable the circumstances of human life. The acts of Christ, ever

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

perfect and all-holy, as the acts of a Divine Person, were, in fact, limited to such form as was called for by the demands and the characteristics of the people among whom He walked, by the situations into which He was cast amid men and things in the Palestine of His day. And then the institutions, reported in the New Testament as ordered by Christ, were germinal, destined to grow and expand in time. As time went by, the acorn pushed upward its branches and leaves; the institutions of Christ took upon themselves new vestures and new modes of action, to suit their new stature. Were the visible Christ in the world to-day, ruling in person the Church, and a Testament were to be written of Him, it should not, in principle and in spirit, be a different Testament from that which was penned in the early days of the Christian religion: but this second Testament would not be identical with the first in the facts it should witness, in the discourses and conversations it should record. Christ would have lived with His Church in the twentieth century, and His acts and words would have been such as the needs and the opportunities of the century suggest or require.

In the New Testament, the Church of Christ was the mustard-seed, the smallest of grains. It has grown up; it is greater than all herbs; it has become a tree so that the birds of the air come and dwell in its branches. To insist that the ruler of the Church of to-day move and speak according to the letter of the New Testament, and not otherwise, is to demand that the great tree, severing itself from roots spread through every land of earth, lopping off branches amid which all tribes and peoples seek shelter, should become the atomic mustard-seed of its Palestinian years.

"Thoughtful Catholics," writes "A Catholic Priest," "have long been aweary of Pontiffs that were great diplomats, great builders, great theologians. A great Christian is what they have been sighing for; a Christian, that is, in its one sole proper meaning—a man, namely, who is like Christ." This is mere juggling with words: if a meaning is intended, it is that the Papacy go back to the fields and lake shores of Galilee, that the world of modern times resolve itself into the conditions of olden Judea.

Diplomats, builders, theologians—that is, precisely, what the Church requires, what correct-thinking Catholics delight to see installed upon the throne of the Fisherman.

The Church, by virtue of its constitution and its mission, is a

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

mighty commonwealth, set down by God upon earth, spiritual in its inmost soul and in the purpose of its being, temporal in its habitat and in much of the means it must make use of to do its work among men. Of course, the Church is a spiritual Kingdom; but it is, also, a temporal Kingdom. The spiritual is not held up in mid-air; it must be housed upon earth. It works, not among angels, but among men; with the affairs of men it must perforce concern itself and it must deal with them by methods within the reach of men, by methods that are human in their nature, whatever otherwise be their intent and ultimate result.

And so the Pope, the Head of the Church and the Supreme representative of its spiritual life and aims, must be a diplomat. He must speak to men individually and collectively; he must address those who are governed and those who govern. With those in power he must argue and negotiate in order to safeguard the interests of religion, to secure for it liberty of speech and of action; and the matter upon which he argues and negotiates will often be the temporal, inasmuch as the spiritual is often bound up with the temporal. Let us take, as an instance, the present condition of things in France. The French Government is glib in proclaiming liberty of conscience for all Frenchmen alike, whether Catholics or non-Catholics. But, at the same time, it enacts laws which do not allow Catholics to enjoy liberty of conscience, unless it be in their interior soul. They are refused the control of their temples requisite as a condition of the outward and public exercise of their religious duties. Is the Pope to sit still in the Vatican — merely to lament and pray, or, as "*Il Santo*" wishes him to do, to go out and spend himself in comforting the sick in some neighboring hospital? No, he must step boldly forward and tell the Government of France that its "Cultual Associations" violate the primary principles of Catholic faith: he must instruct bishops and priests as to their duty in the hour of conflict; he must exhort the faithful to steadfastness, and menace with the penalties of the Church the weaker ones, disposed to perilous compromise. This is diplomacy, and a neglect of it should be a stigma on the Pontificate of Pius X.

Times have changed since the days of the New Testament. There was then no Clémenceau, no Briand: there was then no law of "Cultual Associations." There is no act of Christ giving immediate and explicit warrant to what Pius X is doing. But

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

should Christ have done otherwise than Pius X is doing, had similar circumstances confronted him? Methinks, Christ laid well the foundation of future Papal diplomacy when He chased the money-changers from the Temple, when He proclaimed the great principle that was to regulate in all coming ages the relations between Church and State—"Give to Cæsar the things that are Cæsar's; but give to God the things that are God's."

What is meant by a "builder" in the Roman Pontificate, I may not exactly divine. I take the word to indicate one who organizes the work of the Church in the world, who plans for the widening of its sphere of influence, for its progressive march amid the nations. Surely, in this sense, the Pope must be a "builder." The order of the Master was: "Teach all nations." What else, then, will the Pope do, but open the highways to His messengers, strengthen them in the positions they have been able to occupy, direct, counsel and command, according to succeeding needs, as directs, counsels and commands the general of an army, or the sovereign of a vast empire? What else will he do but build up around him, within his central citadel of action, a group of auxiliaries, and secure to himself and to them such facilities and guarantees of freedom as he may deem conducive to the weal of his ministry? And, throughout, the Pope will be dealing largely with things temporal and adapting himself to rulings and methods of conduct that are human, that are worldly, in the sense that they are necessarily the rulings and methods of the world in which he lives and labors. We are not, indeed, obliged to believe that each and every act of the Pope, in building up and directing the affairs of the Church, is always the wisest and best. No privilege of infallibility was promised to the administrative, as there was to the teaching, Papacy. The individual Catholic is not forbidden to have his own opinion, and to give of it discreet expression. But to question the motives of the Papacy, where reasons for so doing are not evident, to taunt it cavalierly as contrary to "honesty and truthfulness," without clear demonstration of the charge, is unfair and unrighteous. Language of this kind is not that of the loyal soldier of an army, which, in order to win against multitudinous enemies, must be serried in its ranks and united in its object-view; nor is it, even, the language of ordinary good sense, which dictates that, until the contrary is conclusively proven, the judgment of the chieftain is to be trusted and fol-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

lowed, because the chieftain has a deeper consciousness of his responsibilities and is allowed a wider breadth of observation, and is, consequently, more likely to be better informed, and to be more earnest in the performance of duty, than the individual may presume to be. The Catholic Church is by no means a school of slavish subjection, nor of total surrender of thought or action. But the Church, no less, is a school of obedience to authority and of respect for its mandates, and therein has ever lain its strength and its power of ultimate triumph.

"Teach ye all nations, teaching them all things whatsoever I have commanded you." . . . "Preach the Gospel to every creature. He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved; he that believeth not shall be condemned." The primary mission of the Church is to teach: as its chief guide and spokesman, the Pope is primarily a teacher. Whatever else he does, he fails supremely if he has not reechoed through the world the words of Christ—"all things whatsoever I have commanded unto you"—if he has not guarded pure and intact the deposit of faith entrusted to his keeping. Dogma is not the whole religion of the Catholic Church: belief in dogma is not the whole or all-sufficing duty of its members. There must be also the rectitude of conduct, the holiness of soul, if members of the Church are to find favor with the Master. But belief in dogma is a necessary element in this rectitude of conduct, inasmuch as of itself it is prescribed by Christ, and is the recognition of divine authority over the human mind. And belief in dogma has this further importance, that dogma encases the rules making for rectitude of conduct, and gives to them their reasons of being, and the motives that impel to their observance. One of the most marked evils of the day is the neglect, even the contempt, of dogma. Conduct, we are told, is the one thing necessary: why trouble oneself with matters of mere belief? Why does the Church annoy us with its creeds? The answer is given in the words of the Gospel: "Teaching them all things whatsoever I have commanded." . . . "He that believeth not shall be condemned." And, then, what will conduct be without principles and motives? As well may we ask what will the ship be on the broad seas without chart and compass? It ill becomes a writer, willing to sign himself "A Catholic Priest," it ill becomes any one willing to call himself a Christian, to throw slurs upon dogma, as if dogma had the effect of "de-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

stroying the spiritual insight of the heart"; since, on the contrary, dogma it is that quickens that insight and imparts to it supernatural aim and power of action.

The infallibility which the Church attaches to its teachings is limited to formal, authoritative, so-called *ex cathedra,* declarations of matters of faith and morals. Deductions from dogma by theologians, applications of it to practical life, relations established between it and science or history, are not dogmas, are not stamped with the Church's seal of infallibility.

An outcry not seldom raised against the dogmas of Catholic belief is that they are not the plain and simple reading of the New Testament, that the New Testament should be all-sufficient, that Catholics should return to the New Testament, throwing off the burthen heaped upon their shoulders age after age by Councils and Popes. But what has been happening since the New Testament was written? Its germinal truths have been growing, unfolding their divine meaning branch by branch, leaf by leaf, assimilating to themselves cognate truths from every garden of human knowledge, interpreting themselves ceaselessly in accordance with the never-ceasing growth of humanity, with the ever-changing circumstances of its life. The truths of the three earlier Gospels grew with the advent of the fourth; the truths of all the Gospels grew under the pen of Paul: the truths of the whole New Testament grew in every century of the life of the Church. Christian truth has life and motion; it progresses. It is not a dead letter, a mere archæological mummy locked up within the pages of the New Testament. It has grown; and over its growth the Church, under divine guidance, has kept vigilant watch, to hold it ever true to its first germ, ever true to the mind of Him who placed that germ in the soil of the world's life and thought. We must needs be wary with our words when we talk of going back to the New Testament, when we reproach the Church with apparent accumulations of dogmas, as if those were contrary to the teachings of Christ, instead of being the selfsame teachings in their legitimate maturing form. Bring back the teachings of the Church to the New Testament! Will you bring back adult manhood to the cradle of its infancy?

The chief part in the Church's watchfulness over divine truth falls to the Papacy. Is not this to mean that we must have theologians on the throne of Peter?

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

But not to the official and formal definition of dogma is the teaching office of the Papacy to be limited. The Pope is the guardian of dogma. His duty is to watch over the approaches: to ward off peril. His duty is to hold dogma intact in the minds of believers, to warn them against assertions and doctrinal opinions that may weaken their faith, either because of inherent falseness, or of imprudence in form, or of untimeliness in utterance. He is the shepherd of the flock, the father of the family: he must advise, exhort, command, as the need may be: he must guard the sacred "deposit." To do this the more effectively, he gathers in his auxiliaries: hence the Roman "Congregations," or Committees of Cardinals and theologians. The Roman "Congregations" are a bugbear to "A Catholic Priest." Against the "Congregations" under the Pontificate of Pius X. are levelled his severest blows. "Our best scholars," he writes, "have been condemned, their writings have been put on the Index; a violent effort is making by the official theologians of Rome to close the door in the face of scholarship." Let us see what foundation there is for this onslaught upon the "Congregations."

It is not held that Papal infallibility sheds its rays over the deliberations of the Roman "Congregations." Infallibility is personal; even in the Pope himself it is brought into act only on solemn occasions and in a solemn manner. The "Congregations" represent the administrative authority, not the infallibility of the Papacy.

No doubt whatever, the attitude of the Congregations of the Holy Office and of the Index — to which specifically appertain questions of faith and morals—is that of anxious care lest error come near, that of severe restriction when its presence is detected. The "rigidity of Rome" has been talked of, and she is not herself unwilling to pronounce the word. There is so much at stake —the purity of doctrine. There is such wild menace against faith in the recklessness of modern research, in the audaciousness of modern thought. Were Rome to lower the barriers and allow the flood of uncertain and unproven opinion, so rife to-day, so proud and daring, to sweep unchecked into her schools and into her courts, evils there were, far more deplorable than those of an occasional discouragement to a thinker or an explorer, than those of an occasional mistake in her decisions, from which, later, she may have to recede. What if there was a Galileo case? It was

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

one out of a thousand: and when it did occur, something was needed to prevent scandal in Christendom from a mode of exegesis to which scholarship had not yet prepared the public mind. Decisions of the Congregations need bring no alarm to the scholar. They put him on his guard, lest with the gold of truth he mingle the dross of error—as is so often the case in books censured by the Index. They do not forbid further investigation, when the decision bears on science or history. It is the rash, the unproven thesis, not that which is nearing a demonstration, that the Congregations fear and reject.

The record of the Roman Congregations for centuries lies open before the public eye: zeal for religion, intelligence of the needs of the Church, prudence of deliberation characterize its pages. But only to decisions of theirs under the Pontificate of Pius X am I called to make special reference.

There was, first, the condemnation of the books of Abbé Loisy. This condemnation caused an uproar, which has not yet been stilled, among "modern scholars" who are willing, as they say, "to take account of historical and Biblical criticism." But where was there blame for Pius X and the Congregations? Read "*Autour d'un Petit Livre,*" and tell me what is left therein of the doctrine of the Incarnation and the Redemption, what is left therein of the divine origin of the Church and the Sacraments? Either Loisy was to be condemned, or Pius X was to fold his tent and hie himself and his illusion of a divinely established Church into the nebulous regions of fable.

Next, there was the ban put by the Index on the books of Viollet, Laberthonière and Fogazzaro. There may be in those volumes, and undoubtedly there is, much that is true and healthful. The notice was to the writers to revise their pages, to trim here, to add there, if their books are to merit unimpaired circulation among the Catholic laity, and free ingress into Catholic schools and colleges. It is not necessary to have been in the counsels of the Congregation to discover in those books, as they read to-day, mistakes and shortcomings. Viollet, a most estimable jurisconsult and a sincere Catholic, is decidedly too strict a constructionist in the limitations he puts upon the teaching authority of the Sovereign Pontiff. Laberthonière, a philosopher of no mean merit, makes out, it may be admitted, a good case for his apologetics of "immanence"; but he spoils all by, seemingly at least, constru-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ing it as the sole practical system of apologetics befitting the age, to the neglect and exclusion of the more objective argumentation of the older schools of the defenders of the faith. Fogazzaro is a dismal failure as a theologian. His "*Il Santo*" minimizes the importance of dogma and misapprehends totally the public mission of the Church and the Papacy.

Finally, there was the decision of the Scriptural Commission on the Mosaic authorship of the Pentateuch. The decision refuses, indeed, to expel altogether the authorship of Moses from the first five books of the Bible. But, we may ask, does prudent, calm and duly conservative exegesis—so far as exegetic scholarship has gone—deny him therein certainly and absolutely a place as author? The decision lays down rules, by which glaring objections to a complete Mosaic authorship are obviated. Is not this an evidence that the Commission moves with eye intent on the results of modern Scriptural investigation? And, again, by its indirect appeal to well-established facts and theories, it opens the way to further careful study, to the clear conclusion of which it impliedly promises its adhesion. Is there not here an encouragement to scholarship to continue its labors?

What he means by "Truth," we may well ask of "A Catholic Priest," when he defiantly warns Rome that, "despite the despairing rage of the Curia," she "cannot" annihilate Truth. "Like wildfire, the 'new' views," he tells us, "are spreading among Catholics." All depends on what the "new views" are. Are they well-substantiated discoveries in realms of archæology or philology? Such discoveries are spreading among Catholics, and Rome willingly bids them to spread, confident always that no harm can come from true science or from true history to the Christian revelation, even though outposts of its defences may, now and then, suffer alteration. But are the "new views" mere guessings, mere will-of-the-wisps, such as fill the air in these days of mental restlessness? Catholics stand on guard and refuse to recede a single step from olden positions—waiting patiently until the "views" are dissipated into invisible air, or pass from guessings into proven conclusions.

This is the policy of Catholics, the policy of Rome, in presence of "Modern Scholarship," real or fancied; and I will not say that it is not the policy of wisdom on the part of the great Church whose God-given office it is to guard, as the very apple of the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

eye, the all-precious treasure of the revelation once delivered to the Saints.

It is easy to make out a case with a one-sided presentment of facts and circumstances. It is thus that summary judgment is entered by "A Catholic Priest" against Pius X for treatment awarded to Monsignor Bonomelli and to Father Tyrrell. But are there reasons for this judgment? Monsignor Bonomelli, the sweet-tempered and zealous bishop of Cremona, issued a pastoral letter, opposing union of Church and State, and for that he was rebuked by Pius X. Was the rebuke unmerited? I do think that Monsignor Bonomelli would himself now agree with me that his letter was, to say the least, untimely, appearing, as it did, while the French Government was preparing the law of separation, which the Pope has since declared to be, not a law of separation, but a law of oppression. Father Tyrrell has had no quarrel with Pius X. His quarrel is with the Society of Jesus. The rules of the Society he, no doubt, understood well when he entered into its membership; and he should now abide resignedly by the consequences of those rules. As to the letter written in his regard by Cardinal Ferrata, requiring that before he be allowed to say mass he promise to "submit his epistolary correspondence to ecclesiastical authority," I think that all should have been well, if, instead of breaking out into an angry screed, he had questioned further the Cardinal as to what exactly was comprised under the term "epistolary correspondence." Father Tyrrell's so-called "epistolary correspondence," in one instance, at least, has been made the vehicle of dissemination for very perilous theological opinions. Correspondence of that kind the Cardinal would have subjected to ecclesiastical supervision; letters on private personal matters most likely would have gone scot-free.

The "*Lega Democratica Nazionale*" of Italy met with a rebuff from Pius X. Is this such a horrid mistake of his Pontificate? While professing to be a Catholic Association, the "*Lega Democratica*" mingled to no small degree political democracy with religious democracy, thereby compromising the Church before the Italian Government. And, furthermore, while professing to be Catholic, and "wishing above all to promote the highest interests of the faith," it showed little readiness to follow the directions of the hierarchy, the official and divinely appointed keepers of "the interests of the faith." The Catholic Church

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

is a hierarchical institution: whatever is put forth as professedly Catholic must come under its supervision. Pope and Bishops are the responsible parties: the battle, if waged in the name of the Church, must be under their supreme direction. Is Pius X to overlook the vital framework of the Church?

"*Modernita*" is a wide-winged term; it shelters many living things, some clean, others unclean. By itself the term is no clearing-house certificate for all freightage which it may have labelled. This, and nothing more, was intended by Pius X in his Encyclical "*Pieni d'animo*," addressed largely to the younger Italian clergy. New recruits must neither lead the army, nor be trusted by themselves at a distance from its lines. In their ambition to do new things, as befitting a new age, priests are, at times, exposed to the temptation to do things mischievous—"*novità malsana*": they must be cautious. "Progressive civilization"—a term to be spoken with care, lest tares sprout up under its shadow and the good grain be smothered by the rankness of their growth. To what is truly "progressive civilization" the Catholic Church opposes no objection; she gathers into her bosom "the old and the new"—"*nova et vetera*": but she will ever look beneath the name before she makes "the new" her own, before she serves it up as wholesome food to her children.

But "the temporal power"—"the scandalous clamor for provinces and principalities"—"the barbaric pomp of secular kingship"! Why does "A Catholic Priest" study by cunning words to turn the reader's attention from the real point at issue? "Barbaric pomp of secular kingship," in the thought of Pius X and in that of his Secretary of State, Cardinal Merry del Val, plays no part in their protest against the situation to which the Papacy is reduced to-day. The question at issue is the spiritual independence of the Holy See. It is believed, and rightly so, that a *status quo* whereby the Head of the Universal Church is the civil subject of any one potentate gives no stable guarantee of an unfettered spiritual sovereignty. Many are the supposable contingencies in which the subject of one civil power is barred from the confidence of other civil powers. History had solved the problem by granting to the Papacy temporal kingship. The settlement of history was broken up by Italy. The problem is reopened. The Catholic world has not renounced the ideal; the Papacy has not renounced it; the Papacy will not renounce it.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The present position of the Holy See is abnormal: it cannot be taken as permanent. We can leave the solution to Providence; but, meanwhile, the principle must be upheld. This is what is done by Pius X in refusing to be a subject of the Kingdom of Italy. Indeed, it is by so refusing that he maintains *de facto* the dignity and the unfettered spiritual independence of the Holy See. It is not true that the Catholics of the world are opposed in this regard to the policy of the Vatican. They patiently await a solution—nothing more. Few among American Catholics, I imagine, would have been pleased to read in the newspaper despatches, the morning after his accession to the Pontificate, that Pius X, as a liege subject, had repaired to the Quirinal to present his homage to his King and Sovereign. Nor is it true that Italy itself regards the question of the independence of the Holy See as a closed incident. It sees the problem: it may not know how best to solve it: but it is aware that the problem remains. Meanwhile, Pius X has done much, very much, to rid the problem of its practical asperities in Italy.

The "Loubet incident" was deemed by the Vatican a measure of expediency in the public maintenance of principle. The supreme ruler is the supreme judge of what should be done. No one has the right to misjudge his motives, or attribute to him such motives as are utterly impossible to one whose motto, in deed, as in word, is—"*Instanrare omnia in Christo.*"

The Pontificate of Pius X has fallen upon evil days. The unrest of the age is terrific—social, political, moral, religious. Seldom, if ever before, in history was the sea so tempestuous over which the successor of "the Fisherman" is called to steer his Ship of State. That all will be well, despite billows and breakers, we are sure. Christ is with the Church. That, for the time being, the position of His Vicar is most trying, we cannot doubt. The duty of the hour, incumbent upon Catholics, is to gather around him in serried ranks, comfort him by their sympathy, if they cannot aid by word or act—at least never weaken his work, or sorrow his heart, by misjudging his motives, or misrepresenting his purposes and labors.

JOHN IRELAND.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

RESERVE OUR ANTHRACITE FOR OUR NAVY.

BY REAR-ADMIRAL ROBLEY D. EVANS, U.S.N., COMMANDER-IN-CHIEF OF THE NORTH ATLANTIC FLEET.

I BELIEVE that the Government of the United States should at once possess itself of the entire anthracite field of Pennsylvania and retain it for purposes of national defence. And if, through accidental discovery, other deposits of this precious mineral are developed, they should be instantly appropriated by the national Government and reserved for its own uses. Being a sailor, of course I mean naval uses, first of all.

The proposition is, I know, startling, but I believe its soundness can be demonstrated.

A Matchless Naval Weapon.—No other maritime nation possesses a naval weapon of such tremendous power as America in its anthracite. Now and again comes the announcement from some enthusiastic geologist that rich deposits of this coal have been discovered in various foreign lands; but, somehow, these promises never materialize, and the fact remains that America alone possesses hard coal in workable locations. The quantity is not infinite, it is true; and that fact is the basis of this argument; but, practically, America alone produces anthracite, and the nation should realize the value of that possession as a naval weapon beyond the reach of any other sea Power.

And that value is found in the fact that, of all fuels possible of use in war-ships, anthracite alone is capable of developing great power without producing smoke. Clean, hard, of uniform size and easily handled, it burns brightly and strongly under the boilers, without betraying, by the faintest visible emission of smoke from the funnels, the tremendous work it is doing.

Billions of Tons of Bituminous Coal.—Bituminous coal is the world's fuel. It can be found in various degrees of

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

excellence everywhere. Poor indeed is the country that cannot count among its resources at least brown coal, capable of being consumed in specially devised furnaces. Even our Western prairie lands, beyond the Mississippi, yield an inexhaustible store of this material. The quality increases towards the Appalachian range, until we reach the rich Pocahontas fields of Virginia and the inexhaustible deposits of the Cumberland region. France and Germany and Austria possess it, and in the Welsh mines of Great Britain it finds its final development. Even in far-away Australia, in New South Wales and the Japanese Orient, and in that latest great battle-ground of the world, Manchuria, bituminous coal is being dug out of the earth in quantities sufficient, not only for local consumption, but for export as well. It is not possible to estimate with any fair degree of accuracy the amount of this mineral "in sight," as the experts say. Countless billions of tons is the guess of the geologist.

American Consul Mahin of Nottingham, in an official report to the Department of State, quotes German statisticians to show that their country has enough bituminous coal in sight to last two thousand years; 280 billion tons is the figure. Even Great Britain and Ireland can yield nearly 193 billion tons—a supply for four hundred years at the present rate of consumption. Belgium has 23 billion tons underground; France, 19 billion; Austria, 17 billion; and Russia, 40 billion. These figures are dwarfed by the estimates of the resources of the Far East, for one Chinese province—that of Shansi—is credited with the possession of more than a trillion tons of bituminous coal. Siberia and Sakhalin are believed to contain vast deposits of unestimated extent.

So bituminous coal is to-day the fuel of the world's industries; it turns the wheels of all factories; sweats out the iron and the steel from the reluctant earth, and furnishes the electric current that has revolutionized our whole system of life. Also, it propels across the seven seas the ships that carry the world's commerce, and in time of need do its fighting.

Superiority of Anthracite.—But, in my opinion, anthracite is the ideal fuel for American naval purposes. A paramount consideration in naval warfare is invisibility. Strategically, this is one of the greatest factors, either for offence or defence. The ability to creep close upon an enemy's ship without detection is an enormous advantage in the attack; and it goes without saying

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

that the possibility of accomplishing a safe retreat before a superior naval force, or of slipping undiscovered through an enemy's line of battle, is not to be disregarded.

Anthracite helps to these ends, and to others equally desirable. It makes no smoke; and smoke is the telltale signal which betrays the war-ship. Did you ever sit on the deck of a liner, or perhaps on one of the ocean piers of Atlantic City, and watch a merchantman creep along many miles away—even below the horizon—betrayed by its line of smoke? That vessel was going easily, trying to burn her fuel economically—which means, to consume as much as possible of the carbon in her coal, instead of sending it up through her smoke-stacks.

Multiply the coal consumption a dozen times; send out clouds of inky blackness two hundred feet in the air, trailing along ten miles across the sea, and you have a picture of a great battle-ship forging along under forced draught. Mass five or ten or twenty such ships in one fleet, and then imagine the vastness of the signal spread to the enemy, and calculate the chances of escaping detection in a hostile manœuvre.

Costly War Lessons.—When Admiral Dewey made his entrance into Manila Bay on that memorable First of May, disaster nearly followed the use of soft coal. Wisely he chose the night for his enterprise, so as to disguise his approach and conceal the dense clouds of black smoke emitted by his ships. Yet, at a critical moment, the funnels of the "McCullough," urged as the little cutter was to keep up with the leaders, spouted blasts of flame that drew upon her the fire of the great guns on Corregidor Island, at the mouth of the bay. Perhaps it was a fortunate disposition that she was at the end of the fleet, and that all of the fighting-ships had safely passed beyond range of the forts before the "McCullough" hung this warning in the skies.

The testimony of the Russians who defended Port Arthur for nearly a year is also important in its bearing on this question of naval fuel. The lookouts rarely failed to discover the approach of the Japanese besieging fleet and give timely warning to their scouting-ships outside the harbor, and always by the telltale clouds of smoke. Torpedo-boats especially were detected, and when they made their forays by night they were often betrayed by an untimely blaze from their funnels, and forced back by a merciless fire from the guns on the heights.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Obscure Signals. — My own experience on the flag-ship "Maine" has revealed another, and a very grave, objection to the use of bituminous coal in naval warfare, and that is the confusion of signals caused by smoke. A "fleet in being" lives and coheres through the ability of the admiral in command to keep in close touch with its every unit, from the battle-ships of the fighting-line to the scouting cruisers far in advance and on the flanks; with the torpedo-boat-destroyers, the colliers and supply-boats, and perhaps the troop-transports under convoy. The installation of wireless-telegraphic apparatus has done much to make the communication easier and more far-reaching; in fact, it has revolutionized naval strategy. Taking advantage of the progress across the Atlantic of the floating-dock "Dewey," fitted out with the admirable naval system of wireless telegraphy, the capable commanders of my fleet, by a proper method of disposition of their ships, were enabled to keep in touch with Commander Hosley on the "Glacier," leading the towing fleet, and to report to Washington directly, when the "Dewey" was more than a thousand miles distant from our shores.

But these are new and unstable conditions. In time of stress and trouble and for every-day work, the sailor turns to the old reliable system of flag signals—a string of triangles and squares and differently colored bits of bunting hung from the signal-mast of the flag-ship, that indicates precisely to every commander in the fleet the orders of the admiral in command.

That is where we have trouble on the "Maine" when we burn bituminous coal under her boilers. The clouds of dense black smoke frequently so obscure the signal-flags that they cannot be read by the signal-man on the other ships. Sometimes it even becomes necessary for the flag-ship to surrender the position at the head of the fleet that she should preserve, and to fall astern and to the rear, in order that her signals may be seen. That might be disastrous in time of war.

All of this difficulty might be avoided by the use of anthracite, as has been proved by actual trial. Not without remonstrance from the engineers and firemen, most conservative of men, anthracite was tested in the boilers of the "Maine." The fuel was not all that could be desired; it was of the cheapest grade, what is known as "pea coal," for economy was a consideration that could not be lost sight of, and this kind of coal cost no more—

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ton for ton—than good bituminous. The results, however, fully justified the experiment. There was no smoke; the heaviest firing of the furnaces brought forth no torches of flame from the smoke-stacks, and the "Maine" could easily have crept past the most closely guarded harbor entrance in time of war without detection, so far as her firing was concerned. Contrast that trial with the experience of the coast-defence ship "Monterey," burning the soft coal of Puget Sound, with flames issuing from her red-hot funnels, and the decks around them scorched and burning, as reported to the Navy Department, when she made the experiment of using that kind of fuel, to satisfy a local demand. The converted yacht-cruiser "Mayflower" has also tried anthracite, with results as favorable as followed my own test.

Anthracite in the Civil War.—It is a fact not generally known at present that anthracite was the naval fuel of the Civil War, on the Northern side at least, and every American should be proud of that page of history. Only by the use of that fuel was the Federal fleet enabled to maintain the greatest blockade the world has ever known, on thousands of miles of coast-line, from the Virginia Capes to the Mexican boundary on the Gulf of Mexico. The blockade-runners were obliged to use soft coal, and that was their undoing in most cases. Some got through the lines in fogs and bad weather; but, for the most part, they were detected by their trails of smoke and flame long before they could espy the blockading craft burning smokeless fuel, and either driven away or captured. It has been said that the Confederacy was "starved to death"; maybe this was one of the factors that has been overlooked by the historian.

Why Was Anthracite Abandoned?—The question naturally arises, Why was the use of anthracite abandoned by the American Navy? The answer is to be found in two words, "economy" and "speed." For many years after the Civil War, American naval vessels continued to use hard coal. Those were the days of combined sailing and steaming ships, and coal was used sparingly and only in cases where great haste was required. In the ordinary course of naval cruising, the furnaces were lighted only in stress of weather, against head-winds or in making port. There was not as much steam-power in a whole fleet as is represented in a single armored cruiser like the "Maryland." So the coal consumption was small and the bills insignificant.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

When, in the early eighties, the nation awoke to the need of a new navy, our designers naturally turned to British models. Officers were sent abroad to study their plans, and some of these were bought outright and laid the foundations of our New Navy. What are known as our "A-B-C ships" were built on these plans. Good and serviceable ships they were, too, as I can testify, having sailed on and commanded them.

Like all foreign-designed ships, they were planned for the use of soft coal. Their grates were constructed for bituminous coal and their speed calculations based on it. Engineers say that for a given grate surface more power—and that means speed—may be obtained from soft than from hard coal, and speed was then regarded as everything. But we now know that there are other factors in naval warfare quite as important, and I have endeavored to demonstrate that fact. At the time, however, we were swept along in the mad race for speed; the close grate disappeared, and bituminous coal displaced our own black diamonds as the fuel of the Navy. The change satisfied the engineers, ambitious to get the most work out of every pound of machinery and boilers in the ship. And it was agreeable to those high in authority, who were obliged to meet the demands of an economical Congress, because bituminous was cheaper than anthracite at that time, and more cruising could be done for the same amount of money.

Is there a Better Naval Fuel?—Recent wonderful developments in the oil-fields of Texas and California have led many engineers to urge the use of crude petroleum as the ideal naval fuel. The suggestion is enticing; and so strong were the arguments advanced in favor of this easily handled means of producing power, that the Navy Department was induced to enter upon a series of long and costly experiments to determine the comparative value of liquid fuel and coal. For nearly a year some of the most expert naval engineers worked upon the problem in a specially devised plant installed in Washington, trying specimens of every oil offered and testing innumerable inventions in burners.

So far the results have been disappointing. Coal-oil will burn freely under boilers and meet many of the demands of the maritime engineers, especially of the merchant marine. But there are grave objections to its use as a naval fuel. It can be burned with advantage in a ship that is required to jog along at a certain uniform speed on its voyage between ports, but it will not admit of

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

forcing, which is absolutely necessary in naval use. There are occasions when a naval captain must be prepared to drive his ship at top speed, regardless of consequences, and forgetting economy. He may be chasing a blockade-runner or an enemy; he may be fleeing before a greatly superior force. Forced draught must be applied under closed fire-hatches. That is where the oil-fuel fails. Only a certain quantity can be consumed under each boiler, the burners are limited in number, and the steam-pressure cannot be increased, which means that the ship is limited in its speed—there is no emergency ratio.

There are two other objections to the use of oil in the Navy as fuel. The storage aboard ship of the thousands of gallons of this fuel necessary for a cruise, alongside of tons of high explosives, would be exceedingly dangerous. The ship's company would be living over a volcano, so to speak. And in battle a single shell from the enemy might fire the whole ship.

And where will it be possible to secure oil on foreign stations to replenish the tanks of our war-ships? At only a few ports could the petroleum be had at reasonable rates; at most its cost would be prohibitive.

Anthracite for Us.—No; let us turn again to our own anthracite, and let us keep it for our own Navy, every ton of it. Pile it up in our naval stations at home; make great stores of it at the coaling-stations we now have abroad, and acquire more of these stations from friendly nations at convenient points in foreign lands. In a way, it will be safely stored; for, though we may be deprived of it, the ships of no other maritime Power can use it, by reason of the construction of their boiler furnaces, while our own ships may use their bituminous, in case of need, by a few simple mechanical changes in the grate bars.

The Cost of It.—It will be costly, of course, but it will pay to keep our anthracite for our own Navy. The estimates of the Geological Survey place the amount of anthracite "in sight" in America at great figures — no less than sixteen billion tons four years ago; but of this only six billion four hundred and fifty million tons is minable. The Census reports say that this will be exhausted by domestic uses in about fifty years. The consumption in 1905 was 69,339,152 tons and was yearly increasing.

Suppose we should stop this industrial and domestic consumption, and reserve the supply which can never be replenished;

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the American Navy would be coaled for a long time. Last year the Equipment Bureau bought 543,000 tons of coal, and about 50,000 tons were used in the winter manœuvres of the Atlantic fleet in the Caribbean Sea. With the steady annual growth of the Navy, that must surely proceed if America is to retain her place among the World Powers, the coal consumption of the ships must necessarily increase. To be efficient, seamen must be trained, and that means that ships must be kept in commission and must burn much coal.

About eighteen billion dollars would represent, at present values, the available anthracite deposits which the United States Government should acquire to possess the entire store of this fuel. The figures are startling; but remember that this vast sum is not necessarily to be disbursed at once. In fact, it may be spent in the course of centuries—only, indeed, as the fuel is mined and consumed. It will be for the actuary to calculate the compensation which the Government shall make to the individual owners of the coal-fields; to capitalize their holdings, and provide for a systematic reimbursement. Of the wisdom of such a transaction I have no doubt. Think of the insurance value of the great ports of America. Many millions are spent every year to guard against losses by such earthquakes and fires as almost destroyed San Francisco; why not spend a few millions annually to safeguard all of these ports against a fierce naval attack?

Against our will; by the practice of the arts of peace; indeed, through our industrial competition with foreign nations and our insistence upon our rights to equal privileges and fair treatment; we may at any moment be plunged into hostilities. That is where that celebrated utterance of Pinckney's would find its bearing—"Millions for defence but not one cent for tribute." The millions would lie in our anthracite-beds, and our Navy would do the rest. Picture the fate of a vast hostile fleet assembled off our Atlantic seaboard, with its colliers and tenders laden with soft coal, belching great clouds of smoke of inky blackness by day and columns of fire by night, while around them circled our swift scouts and cruisers and torpedo-boats and, within convenient signal range, our great battle-ships, each representative of a sovereign State—all well-nigh invisible, but ready to dash in at an opportune moment and deal a vital stroke. And all because of anthracite. Would it not pay?

R. D. Evans.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

PHYSICAL DETERIORATION AMONG THE POOR IN AMERICA AND ONE WAY OF CHECKING IT.

BY THE REV. PERCY STICKNEY GRANT.

At the Naval War College, Newport, my host mentioned to me, when I left him for the night, that it would be worth my while next morning to be on hand before breakfast for the marching past, at a little distance from the college, of the naval apprentices. The definiteness and originality of Admiral Chadwick's observations are too well known to be disregarded. Indeed, I was splendidly repaid for my descent into the freshness of the bright summer morning. To the west, the blue channel was active with passing craft. To the south, the harbor was white with the sails of anchored yachts. Near our shore lay the white bulk of war-vessels. On the training-ship, which was anchored against a wharf, fluttering lines of washed, sailor togs were bleaching. Along the carriage-drive, from a neighboring green, advanced, in column by fours, a white-canvassed army of apprentices. Their faces and necks, between their white hats and white blouses, were bronze. Besides color there was contour—large strong curves. The boys were of football build, broad and big-limbed. The carved similarity of feature reminded me of the big wooden faces of the Finnish sailors in the Russian navy, enough alike to be of one family. The column tramped by and lost itself in the barracks.

I had received a strong impression. I inquired about the lads, from what class of Americans such a stocky set was recruited. "Oh," said an officer, "we pick them up in the cities. They do not look like that when they come to us—not a likely set—narrow-shouldered and knock-kneed, many of them appear.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Once here, however, they have a routine—plenty of sleep, fresh air and salt-water swimming; plenty to eat, beginning with a cup of cocoa in the morning, when they turn out for the exercise they have just now finished; and on top of all this, the best oversight we can give them." "But how long does the transformation take from a spindling boy of the tenements to one of these roly-poly athletes?" "We have had them two or three months," said the officer.

I had received another strong impression. If such remarkable physical development could be induced in so short a time in such unlikely stock, ought not municipalities, at their own expense, maintain during the summer, training-camps where the children of the slums could be set out to blossom into finer physique?

Physical Deterioration Pronounced among our City Poor.—Nothing has surprised me more, in twenty years of parish work in a manufacturing town and in a metropolis, than to discover the wretched physique of the poor. In most European countries, height and weight are slightly decreasing. In England, Tommy Atkins is getting smaller and smaller; recruits even five feet two inches tall, and with a chest measure of thirty-three and one-half inches, are hard to find.

Our own National Guard, a selected body of men, does not prove at a crisis to represent the necessary physical condition for modern warfare. Many militiamen, at the outbreak of the Spanish War, could not pass the physical requirements of the United States Army. The War Department informs me that although there are no accurate figures, such failures to qualify from the National Guard amounted at least to twenty-five per cent. At the time the enlistment was going on, the newspapers stated that, in some regiments, fifty per cent. were unable to pass the doctors.

The school children of New York are given physical examinations and supervision by the Board of Health. This expert inspection and treatment have done much good and cannot be too highly praised; but it is found that 66 1-3 per cent. of the children examined need a physician's care, and that 95 per cent. of the backward and truant children are defective.

The Causes of Impaired Physique among our City Poor.—The causes of physical deterioration among the poor of the cities, are not far to seek. One is overcrowding, another is underfeeding.

In 1803, only three per cent. of the population of the United

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

States was urban; now nearly forty per cent. reside in cities; while in such a State as New York the percentage is a great deal higher. The growth of cities is not a peculiarity of a new country; in Europe, the capitals have carried away surrounding suburbs in the push of their packed condition. In fact, a general condition has operated to the same end in Europe and America.

A farm laborer in the United States to-day can produce five times as much as in 1850. "The introduction of machinery has increased the productive power of each laborer in agriculture, so that fewer persons produce more product; and the consequence has been that a large portion of the population has changed from agriculture to various kinds of manufacture and transportation."* The vastness of this change is illustrated by the State of Virginia, eighty per cent. of whose population is still employed on the soil. In this respect, it is on a level with India, where the percentage is the same, but India is a congeries of nations not yet emerged from an agricultural and handicraft civilization. Less than 40 per cent. of our population is agricultural.

The city has come to stay. We cannot correct city congestion by spreading its population in the unsettled lands of the South and West, upon our nearer and abandoned farms, or in our suburbs. The city is an economic and spiritual necessity. Men must be in closest association to produce wealth with the least possible waste, and also for that personal contact which, patiently and kindly met, develops, as nothing else can, mind, heart and will. They must labor together for economic advantage and live together for spiritual elaboration.

The increased density of population increases the death-rate. Dr. Newsholme declares:†

"The higher death-rates which are usually associated with increased density of population are not the direct results of the latter. The crowding of people together doubtless leads to the rest, to fouling the air and water and soil, and to the increased propagation of infectious diseases, and thus affects the mortality. But more important than these are the indirect consequences of dense aggregation of population, such as increase of poverty, filth, crime, drunkenness and other vices, and, perhaps more than all, the less healthy character of urban industries. Of the direct influences connected with the aggregation of population,

* United States Census, 1900.
† "Vital Statistics," pp. 157, 159.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

filthy conditions of air and water and soil are the most important. Poverty of the inhabitants of densely populated districts, implying, as it does, inadequate food and deficient clothes and shelter, has a great effect on swelling their mortality."

Where there is a high death-rate, there will be deterioration of physique. Many are attacked by disease who do not succumb, and these have their vitality diminished and carry through life physical weaknesses or blemishes produced by the disease.

Class and Race Acclimatization Potent Factors in City Physical Deterioration.—With the growth of industrialism, cities must expand. In the country farms are deserted; in the city, mushroom apartment-houses spring up. The man whose father followed the plough, must spend his days on a bookkeeper's stool and breathe close, city air. A majority of the men and women of the United States will soon live in tenement-houses. The cradle of the future American citizen will be the tenement. Our cities are not only filled from our abandoned farms with people who for generations have been used to the vigor of country labor; our cities are filled with aliens. We are crowding the tenements with foreigners. The American farmer's boy is trying to breathe in the devitalized air of the city, and the European peasant is trying to keep his health in America. Class and race acclimatization are going on at once. The farmer is bent upon becoming a factory or mercantile unit; the foreigner hastens to become an American. This is serious business. If you know any mill town full of foreigners, you have mourned over the deterioration of physique in the second generation. American food, hot summers, cold winters, stuffy tenements play the mischief with ruddy, beefy Englishmen or Irishmen or whom you will. I have been repeatedly shocked to find girls of sixteen among cotton operatives with full sets of false teeth. Our own ancestors had to fight the climate. The children of the colonists made hard work of survival. Cotton Mather (and he was of the intelligent, comfortable class three generations from Plymouth Rock) had some fifteen children, of whom only four survived him. After three hundred years we ought to know how to assist acclimatization and largely escape its losses.

Underfeeding a Factor in Physical Deterioration.—In England thirty per cent. of the population are living below the margin of proper nourishment. In Edinburgh seventy-five per cent.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

of the school children have disorders due to underfeeding. In New York seventy thousand school children, Robert Hunter tells us, go to school without sufficient breakfast. Whatever the exact number may be, there are too many ill-nourished school children, as teachers can testify, who find that empty stomachs make drowsy and dull brains. It is a fallacy due to political exigencies to suppose the American working-man fares sumptuously. From observation in the homes of working-men I believe that their food is meagre in nutritive value, if not in amount. "Perverse or defective nutrition tends to retard growth and to delay the characteristic growth periods and also final size attained is thus reduced."*

Child Labor.—Mrs. Florence Kelley, Secretary of the National Consumers' League, says:

"Child labor exists in the United States on a large scale, in spite of the trade-unions and of recently formed philanthropic committees to restrict it and to mitigate the evils which attend it."

There are 1,752,187 children, between the ages of ten and fifteen years, working for wages in the United States, more than half the number in non-agricultural pursuits.† In a single factory in New York, 300 children under school age were found. The employment of children in factories of the United States from 1890 to 1900 increased forty per cent.

Wendell Phillips, in describing Boston's reception to Lafayette upon his return to America in 1824, said that "the city gave him the best it could afford, a sight of its school children." What children they were from whose ranks looked out those piercing eyes, that later did not quail at mobs or obloquy, the eagle glance of Phillips! Does New York consider its school children its most interesting and distinguished possession? Should we collect a procession from the swarming tenements to grace a great foreigner's visit? Poor children, poor guest! While we are shocked at what crowding and poverty can do to destroy physique, we are having looming illustrations of what air and exercise can do to improve it. Nature is struggling always to improve her children. The children of mixed racial marriages in America tend to the physique of the larger parent.

* "Adolescence," Stanley Hall, II., p. 32.
† Bulletin of the American Institute of Social Science.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

"The anthropometric committee's study in England found that boys from the better classes at ten were 3.31 inches taller and 10.64 pounds heavier than industrial-school boys, and at fourteen were 6.65 inches taller and 21.85 pounds heavier."*

Professor Phillips of Amherst declares that "the young man to-day at every age is taller and heavier than the man previous to 1894, the difference, as a rule, amounting to an inch in height and three pounds in weight." The increase of height and weight of Princeton students has been such in thirty years that, if it continued until 1950, the average student would be six feet tall and weigh 160 pounds. The part that out-of-door exercise plays in this general improvement can be guessed by the fact that, in one summer camp I know, the boys usually gain in weight from six to twenty pounds.

Physical betterment which is the effort of nature and the result of increasing knowledge, is retreating to-day, among the poor of great cities, before unusual conditions. A change from a lower to a higher civilization, from an agricultural and handicraft to an industrial manner of life, for the time being, is injurious to the individual. Evidently, there should be improvement in health accompanied by increase in strength and longevity, due to the recent enormous enlightenment from science, especially in those departments that teach sanitation and the cure of disease. But with the coming of a better hygiene has cropped out a new enemy to health, the overcrowding and underfeeding of the poor in great cities. This deterioration, that should be temporary and merely a matter of readjustment, as great populations pass from an agricultural to an industrial manner of life, can be counteracted by a systematical plan of physical betterment.

A Summer Camp for Public-school Boys.—One remedy for deterioration of tenement physique is very evident. Give at public expense to the poor the physical opportunities and some of the food the rich secure for themselves. A summer camp for boys is no novelty. Camps for the sons of the rich are in high favor. Started about twenty years ago, they have offered such rough out-of-door living and training in physical independence to hothouse children, that they are now innumerable. Why cannot the summer camp be grafted upon our public-school system? It could be approached from two directions: either from

* "Adolescence," I, p. 34.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the philanthropic fresh-air work which sends thousands of children every summer into the country for a week or so; or from the side of educational tendencies. Schools are now used after regular sessions for play. A few contain gymnasiums and some new buildings are to contain baths; they have, besides, elaborate evening classes running over into myriad courses of popular lectures. In England and France, experiments have been tried in feeding as well as teaching school children, with marked results. Extension of agencies, of seasons, of objects aimed at, marks public education. Why not undertake a further school extension to practically unused seasons—the summer; toward that which underlies mental power—the firm muscle, the obedient nerve, the agreeable bodily condition. All this, of course, means *compulsory physical training*. And why not? What a number of anxieties our modern life would be in a way to get rid of, if the War College human exhibit could be multiplied by the cities and towns of the United States.

Ineffective Physical Training in our Public Schools.—No public-school system of physical training, that I am acquainted with, is thorough. In the New York elementary schools, gymnastics are given eighteen minutes daily the first year; fifteen minutes the remaining seven years. This little more than corrects the spinal deformities of "the school-desk attitude." In the High School there seem to be two forty-minute periods weekly. But infrequent exercise only makes muscles sore and disinclines the sufferer to their use. The absence of baths, etc., neutralizes the advantage of any exercise that opens the pores. Very little of our public-school physical culture takes hold. The New York Public School Athletic Association is an admirable attempt to meet public-school deficiencies; but its existence argues the need of extending the department of physical instruction in the public schools. What the Turners or the class system in the Young Men's Christian Association, or the setting-up exercises in the United States Army or Swedish gymnastics accomplish, I ask to have done for every boy and youth in America. Every human body has latent physical possibilities. I knew a young fellow of the "tough" class, who served a term of four years in a State prison for manslaughter. Although he was twenty-two years of age when he entered, such were the improved conditions of his life while in prison that, when he

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

was discharged at the age of twenty-six, he had gained an inch and a half in stature and thirty pounds in weight. Even great physical development is generally possible. "I firmly believe that the now so wonderful performances of most of our strong men are well within reach of the majority of men, if such performances were seriously enough part of the ambition."*

In addition, if necessary, I would provide nourishing food for these boys in training at least once a day. "Poor children, brought into a better nutritive environment, grow more rapidly than those who remain in unchanged conditions."†

Compulsory Physical Training in Europe.—A general system of physical education in America would produce many of the advantages derived in Europe from compulsory military service and its attendant compulsory physical training. In France, Germany and Austria, a compulsory system of physical training is in force in all educational institutions, both civil and military, and has had an influence upon the national physical development. The soldier, after his enrolment, continues a course of physical training with which as a boy and youth he has become familiar, and the main features of which still remain the essentials of his military education. Among the schools of England, as in our own, no special gymnastic training is officially required. The taking of proper exercise is left largely to the individual, much to his physical disadvantage when compared with the corresponding classes in the countries just named, and to the detriment of the military service of which he may ultimately become a part.

In 1873, the French Government made physical training compulsory in all schools, and since that time immense improvement has been made in the development of the French. As in the other Continental armies, swimming is taught at all stations where the facilities exist. Some of the gymnastic exercises are accompanied by music.

In Austria, the highest importance is attached to the physical education of both soldiers and civilians, it being compulsory.

In Italy, Norway, Sweden, Denmark and Switzerland physical culture is looked upon as necessary as, and also as being an aid to, the mental and military education of the individual.

* H. G. Beyer, "Adolescence," I, p. 197.
† The same, I, p. 32.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

American Precedent for Compulsory Physical Training.—If we resent or fear to follow foreign example, our impulse need not come from abroad:

"In 1790, President Washington transmitted to the First Senate of the United States an elaborate scheme prepared by General Henry Knox, then Secretary of War, for the military training of all men over eighteen and under sixty. The youth of eighteen, nineteen and twenty years were to receive their military education in annual camps of discipline to be formed in each State, and a military prerequisition was proposed as a right to vote. This plan failed of adoption, as did also the following recommendation, that was urged in the national House of Representatives in 1817 and 1819, 'that a corps of military instructors should be formed to attend to the gymnastic and elementary part of instruction in every school in the United States.'"*

Noah Webster seems to have been the first American of note to propose the institution of a college course of physical training. In 1820, he declared that it should be "the buzziness of young persons to assist nature and strengthen the growing frame by athletic exercise."†

The Round Hill School at Northampton, Massachusetts, under George Bancroft, in 1823, was "the first in the new continent to connect gymnastics with a purely literary establishment."‡

The Boston gymnasium, opened in the Washington Gardens, October 3, 1826, with Dr. Foolen as its principal instructor, seems to have been the first public gymnasium of any note in America.

Gymnastic grounds were established at Yale in 1826, and at Williams, Amherst and Brown in 1827.

Between 1830 and 1860, no general revival of interest in school or college athletics occurred.

The study of physiology and an enthusiasm for its benefits which appeared in the first half of the nineteenth century, is largely responsible for the renewal of interest in gymnastics just before the war. Modern athletics in America were not produced by the Civil War, and are not the fruit of militarism. It may, however, require military defeat to spur us to compulsory physical training, as was the case with Germany, Austria and France.

The gymnastic revival in America has taken place in our own times. "Tom Brown's School-days" and "Tom Brown at Ox-

* United States Education Report, 1897–98, p. 553.
† The same, p. 552.
‡ The same, p. 554.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ford" stimulated it in the later sixties. Dio Lewis and Dr. Winship gave it eloquent publicity and system.

Although in Boston there is a normal training-school for physical training where the Swedish system is taught, although calisthenics are used in most schools to ease the physical strain of sitting for hours on school seats and to correct harmful positions, there is in America no serious consideration of physical training as a part of the educational system.

The Economic Advantage of Better Physical Training.—When a general scheme of compulsory education is advocated, the adoption of such a plan must be proved to be of economic value. It is easy to show this. An increase of five per cent. in the economic value of working-men in Germany under fifty years of age, would pay for the standing army. In England, many men who have had army training are paid twenty-five per cent. more than current wages in their trades. Physical betterment is already recognized as a financial asset. If we may reckon the wage-earners as a third of our population, and suppose them to earn a dollar and a half a day for three hundred days, the value to the country of extending their working careers by only one year would be twelve billion dollars. The actual figures are probably much higher.

The economic effect of education should be to endow every person with wealth-producing ability. In the United States, in 1890, each member of the population was credited with the production of new wealth values to the amount of fifty-one and a half cents a day. How can these figures be raised still higher? While invention and machinery enter largely into the answer of this question, the effectiveness of every worker is a great factor. His mental efficiency, moreover, furthers invention and the use of machinery. Whatever contributes, then, to the strength of mind and body increases the production of wealth. Physical health and strength, directly and indirectly, are prime factors in national economics.

Physical culture for military service, although undertaken in maturity, is of so large advantage that it reacts beneficially upon the productive energies of society. In the training of recruits, it is found that "the greatest of all changes was the change in bodily activity, dexterity, presence of mind, an endurance of fatigue; a change a hundredfold more impressive than any other."

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

A man's economic value to-day depends with fresh illustration upon his physical powers. Some railway corporations will not tolerate cigarette-smoking, and some New York banks forbid the use of alcohol among their employees on or off duty. The tests of eyesight for color-blindness have become in our generation a requirement of great services. Corporations, too, are getting rid of old men and try to employ no one over forty years of age. One reason for child labor is the early decrepitude of parents among laboring populations. Physical betterment would preserve the vigor of the average working-man beyond early middle life; would free him from need of stimulants; would extend the period during which he could support himself and educate his family; would increase the ability of wage-earners to provide for old age; and would enlarge the wealth-producing population.

The enormous increase of late in automatic machinery will throw thousands of mechanics into the ranks of unskilled labor, there being no longer demand for their skill. The only hope for these men is to lift themselves and children by education and physical force to the class of brain workers or superintendents.

Moral Advantages of Better Physical Training.—A great deal of work that we, in our debilitated and nervous generation, throw upon the moral nature of man ought to be put upon the physical nature. ' We have overburdened the moral and have asked altogether too many tasks of it; it not only is expected to stand the stress of great crises and to develop higher spiritual traits, but it must be constantly on duty to drag the erring individual away from casual lapses. A normal body should do this.

It is a well-known fact that physical exercise diminishes sexuality. Talcott Williams, of Philadelphia, investigated the morality of students of the University of Pennsylvania. Upon the testimony of the physicians at the University, he discovered student morality to be incredibly higher than it was twenty years ago. The reason assigned was the attention almost universally given by students to athletics. The same facts, morality and athletics, are associated in the leading American Universities.

At Elmira Reformatory, the introduction of athletic exercise among the prisoners produced astonishing results, not only in the physique but the behavior and moral attitude of the men.*

* New York State Reformatory at Elmira. Seventeenth Year-Book, pages P' and following.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

To judge from the photographs, much moral delinquency might have been set down to the physical plight of incoming prisoners.

Health is the best mentor; a sick, devitalized man is restlessly driven to all sorts of substitutes for strength, to drink, to pleasure, to passion—in fact, to any excitement that momentarily stimulates his energies. Health has no need of narcotics and will hold a man to a proper and reasonable manner of life. To ask the will to keep a neurotic out of mischief, is to postpone physical improvement and hasten a final catastrophe. We have no business to be asking for the commanding officer when his orderly can answer our questions. Even healthy-mindedness has enormous physical utility. The thought of sunny, quiet, fertile fields can deliver the mind from despondency and even dissuade from desperate action.

The problem of crime is simplified by compulsory physical training. "Lack of exercise," said Miss Agnes M. Hayes, of Public School No. 35, "is the chief cause of thieving. If the boys had more playground, more air and sunshine, they would not gamble, and it is gambling that leads to stealing. They would rather play football than get down in a cramped position to play craps."

Summer is the season of crime. Law-breaking, like a noxious plant, flourishes with the sun; even among school children, unruliness increases with the temperature. There are twice as many bad boys as usual when the temperature ranges between 80 and 90, and three times as many when the thermometer soars still higher. Crime, immorality and suicide hold high carnival in June, July and August. If the children who swarm the tenement-houses could live during the summer in the country, under a splendid physical regimen, not only would much actual law-breaking be prevented, but incipient tendencies towards crime averted.

Mental Advantages of Improved Physique.—To-day we can trace physical advantage very far. Professor Mosso, of Turin University, says:*

"We attain in training a maximum of intensity, and we keep ourselves, not for an instant only, at the culminant point of physical force, but even when the muscles have returned to their natural size after long rest, even for months the beneficent effect of exercise remains."

* "The Theory and Practice of Military Hygiene," by E. L. Munson, p. 400.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

This benefit is largely in the storage of nervous strength. Charles Mercier, the English alienist, points out that, as states of mind are but the obverse side, the shadows, of nervous processes, whatever has effect upon the nervous processes has effect on the mental states. Memory, for instance, is on the bodily side the reviviscence of a physical process that has previously been active. The physical basis of memory is only too apparent to most of us, who can remember better in the morning than in the evening, better before eating than after, better after exercise than before. Physical exercise is used to-day by alienists as a means of mental development. A few muscular movements, tried over and over again, may constitute the first steps of a progressive education and the starting-point of mental improvement.

Mental and physical power are normally found together. "The children who make the best progress in their studies are on the average larger in girth of chest and width of head than children whose progress is less satisfactory."

Physical Training as a Hygienic Precaution.—Besides economic and moral advantage from improved national physique, there would be the individual blessings which accrue to any one who has added to his health and to his intelligence.

Physical buoyancy, the feeling of worth and serviceableness, goes far to transform life from a treadmill into a delightful opportunity. The brain is directly benefited by muscular exercise and cleared of humors and freakiness.

"Proper physical training favors a symmetrical brain development, as exercise of the functions governing the action of muscles must favor the growth and development of those centres. Bodily exercise does not interfere with mental activity, and all nervous functions by it are improved in tone."

Length of days, that Biblical blessing, more likely now to be enjoyed than ever before, is directly fostered by physical culture.

"The habit of breathing properly is a great factor in longevity, and a roomy thorax and strong heart are no mean allies in resisting invasion by disease. When the latter has actually gained a foothold a few additional cubic inches of respiratory capacity or a small reserve of disciplined cardiac power may suffice to turn the scales in pneumonia or typhoid fever."*

* "The Theory and Practice of Military Hygiene," by E. L. Munson, p. 38.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

It is an old saying that every inch a man adds to his chest measure adds to the measure of his days. America can show twice as many physicians to population as Great Britain, and four times as many as Germany.* We have seventy times as many physicians in proportion to the general population as physical directors. We permit this disparity on the theory, perhaps, that an ounce of prevention is worth a pound of cure. Prevention needs more numerical representation. I am, then, pleading that the following steps may be taken in public-school instruction:

1. An effective system of physical education to be a recognized part of our public-school system. By "effective" I mean one that does for a boy, so far as his physique is susceptible, what the United States Army setting-up exercises do for a recruit. The precise system to be established by a committee of experts.

2. Athletic exercises in schools, using gymnasiums, baths, etc.

3. Open-air exercises and sports under official supervision.

4. Summer camps, free of cost and compulsory in attendance, for boys of school age.

5. A noon meal for poor children in elementary and high schools.

* "Adolescence," I, p. 197.

PERCY STICKNEY GRANT.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

A REVIVAL OF THE "KNOW-NOTHING" SPIRIT.

BY THOMAS L. JAMES, FORMERLY POSTMASTER-GENERAL OF THE UNITED STATES.

THE possible outcome of the anti-Japanese agitation in California may be productive of such grave consequences that the position of the administration relative to it becomes one which to my mind is of the utmost importance. The incident may seem to the casual observer to concern only a small portion of the country, but this is not so. It is a matter that concerns the entire nation. Hence the prompt and decisive action of President Roosevelt has inspired me with profound confidence in the perception and the wisdom which he has displayed. Apparently, he has fully appreciated how critical the situation has really become and has conceived the right way and the right time in which to act.

The attitude of the school authorities of California in insisting that Japanese children shall receive instruction apart from others —that they shall be isolated from other races—illustrates a spirit which is not new in the United States. Some of our citizens can well remember the agitation of fifty years ago, which widely prevailed among us—an agitation against a class of people who today are most essential to our progress and prosperity by reason of their numbers and their ability. I need only recall the famine in Ireland in the early fifties. The sending of shiploads of food from America to its starving peasantry was followed by an exodus from the island to these shores. The time, however, seemed especially propitious for the coming of these people. The opening of the Erie Canal had quickened the development of the West, and that was speedily followed by the building of the railroads, so that the demand was great for men who could use the shovel, pick

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

and the spade. Nearly all of these immigrants obtained employment, and those of us to-day who were then young can remember that the work upon the highways, the excavating and grading for railroads, the digging of trenches through the city streets for the laying of gas and water mains were labors almost exclusively performed by the Irish immigrants. In fact, so truly foreign were many of these people that they spoke, if not the pure Gaelic language, at least a dialect of it. Their conversation with one another as they labored was as unintelligible to an American as is that of the Italian working-men who have, through their great immigration, succeeded the Irish so largely as unskilled laborers.

But with the coming of these immigrants and the frequently improper use of them to political ends, there arose a jealousy on the part of certain people who pretended to see in them danger to native American labor. It is an interesting fact that those who now discriminate against the people of Japan that come to the United States, and who also have discriminated against the Chinese, are employing almost the identical arguments that were used by the enemies of the Irish, even the German, immigrants half a century ago. This hostility became so wide-spread that in Massachusetts even convents were searched to discover the hiding-place of some unhappy Irishman, also to discover documents or anything that would tend to show that this immigration was permanent, and that the immigrants expected to become American citizens. In Pennsylvania, opponents of the foreigner displayed their enmity to such an extent that riots and bloodshed occurred. In New York City, this opposition resulted in the now traditional Astor Place riots, even threatening the life of the renowned English actor, Macready.

The opposition crystallized into that secret political organization, the "Know-nothing" party. In New York State, this party nominated Daniel Ullmann for Governor. Of him it was said that he was born in India, and he was, therefore, nicknamed "The Hindoo." In some States where the movement was triumphant for a time, as in Connecticut, the "Know-nothing" party was at least of indirect influence. It may be needless to say that the agitation reached its climax in 1856, through the nomination of Millard Fillmore and Andrew J. Donaldson for President and Vice-President, the party calling itself "the American party," although it proclaimed the "Know-nothing"

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

principles, colloquialized into the expression, "Put none but Americans on guard."

I was one of those, and I am proud now to recall the fact, who then opposed this political party and the entire spirit represented by the "Know-nothing" movement, as I felt that this opposition to immigration was in complete violation of the fundamental principle upon which the American Republic is built. I opposed it exactly as I opposed the extension of slavery, and for the same reason. I felt that if we were not able to receive and care for the oppressed of other lands, who sought freedom and an opportunity in the United States, then there was no vitality in the principle of popular sovereignty, and that the expressions in the Declaration of Independence that were afterwards formulated into organic law by the Constitution of the United States were mere empty platitudes. Time showed that the majority of American citizens not merely repudiated the "Know-nothing" party, but reproached it and held its members in contempt.

My views were afterwards confirmed by many experiences, such as the cordial welcome which the United States gave to the first Japanese Embassy that visited this country. The two civilizations met, neither finding anything fundamentally repugnant to it in the other, notwithstanding the extreme racial distinctions which were emphasized by the comparison of this embassy with the men of our own formal gatherings who met and welcomed them.

In the seventies the distinguished American citizen of Chinese birth, Yung Wing, who was in favor with the dynasty and authority of China at that time, persuaded his home Government to make choice of some two hundred young men who were to be sent to the United States, and so educated, not merely in the text-books and in the language of this country, but also in our principles of the science of government, our conception of popular sovereignty and our scientific achievements, that they would be able upon their return to China to make such use of their learning as would be for the welfare of that nation. Yung Wing, himself, was a convincing illustration of the capacity of the Chinaman to accept and to understand American civilization, while at the same time in no sense ignoring or repudiating the traditions and history of the Chinese Empire, or the inevitable relation which it is to bear in the future to the nations of the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

world. He was a man of the highest cultivation, of simple dignity, great learning, true courtesy, and a welcome friend at the homes of the great statesmen of this country and of Europe. The personality and achievements of Yung Wing caused those who met him to note the perfect assimilation of the new and the old civilization of which he was an example. The students whom he brought to the United States attended schools at Hartford, at Springfield and at other places. They were graduated at our colleges, as have been many of the young men of Japan.

Some of us can recall the approach of Commodore Perry to Japan; how he, with the guns of his frigates pointed, if not menacingly, at least impressively, towards the shore, brought about communication with the natives, followed by the Treaty which opened Japan to the United States for certain reciprocal trade. And it is a fact that, to-day in Japan, Commodore Perry's is a name surpassed in the veneration and traditional admiration in which it is held only by those of the great heroes of the Empire. Since the visit of that famous American sailor, we know how the Japanese have welcomed the American, establishing American colleges, cultivating trade, tolerant of the missionaries, and striving in every way to maintain friendly relations with us.

We would be false to our principles if we did not earnestly repudiate the disposition manifested by some of the people on the Pacific Slope, which, it seems to me, is no more than the adoption of the abandoned principles of isolation which were maintained in Japan and China for so many years. If these nations can afford and dare to open their gates to Americans, and even welcome them, why should we fear a reciprocity of that sentiment and method? The statement attributed to President Roosevelt, that he will exhaust all the authority which he possesses before he is willing to abandon the solemn obligations expressed in our Treaty with Japan, is this but a twentieth-century echo of the demonstration made by Commodore Perry in Japan at the middle of the past century? If Americans could then applaud with enthusiasm the action of Commodore Perry and give to him such tributes as they have accorded to him for his achievements, why should not Americans now unanimously applaud the determination of President Roosevelt to maintain in the United States, by all the power which he possesses, that which Commodore Perry secured to us in Japan? If the spirit that inspired the "Know-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

nothing" movement of half a century ago was so abhorrent to American institutions, then the disposition at this time to revive that spirit, purely for racial reasons, is equally objectionable.

I have always been one of those who believe that, while we should freely receive the foreigner and extend a cordial welcome to people of other lands who wish to throw in their lot with us, we should be careful to discriminate so that we may not become, as it were, the dumping-ground of the slag of humanity. Stringent immigration laws are absolutely necessary, but stringent only as respects the individual, not in any way affecting a man because of his race, his previous condition of servitude, his religious belief or even his lack of religious faith. The Government officers should make careful inspection, so that the victims of disease, in mind or body, the criminal who is not a mere political malefactor, may be refused admittance. But I am utterly opposed to racial distinction or discrimination, and I believe that, in the long run, a policy of that kind, directed against the people of any race or civilization, will lead to national injury, almost inconceivable in its malign consequences.

In a series of visits to England, I have discovered that in that limited monarchy there is actually greater toleration than in the United States towards the immigrant foreigner seeking a new home. Sometimes, when I have made this statement, I have been met with the answer that "England is a little country, and that there is no opportunity for immigration to overrun it." But, in reply to that, we can point to Canada, almost as great in area as the United States, and with boundless possibilities for the future. Yet Canada has never had any fear that there would be such an invasion from the Orient across the Pacific as would endanger the industries, or contaminate the morals, of the Canadians. The laws relative to the immigration of objectionable persons are as stringent in Canada as in the United States; but no group of persons find an intolerant or obstructing hand raised against them when they disembark at a Canadian port, merely because they are of a certain race.

The treatment often accorded to gentlemen, scholars, merchants, who have sought to enter the United States from the Orient is so offensive that we should not be surprised to hear that throughout China there is resentment too, because men held in high esteem in the Empire should have been subjected to igno-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

miny and insult, when seeking entrance to the United States, solely because they are citizens of China.

The question, as I have said, is one which, in both a material and a moral sense, affects not merely the Pacific Slope, but the entire United States. We have been for fifty years endeavoring to cultivate friendly relations with these people of the Orient. We have sent our missionaries there. We have obtained great concessions. Statesmanship brought to us the half-way islands of the Pacific; and that strange and unexpected destiny, consequent upon the war with Spain, irresistibly committed to us, though not of our own volition, the Philippine Archipelago. We are to spend two hundred millions or more in the construction of the Panama Canal, whose chief purpose is to make us paramount competitors for the trade of the Pacific. We expect to secure a far broader market for our products in China and Japan. We are dependent on these countries for the greater proportion of our foreign trade across the Pacific. Consequently, there has never been a time when the relations of the United States with these two Empires were more important. The necessity of cordial sentiment between the three nations is of vital import, not only to the merchant and manufacturer, but to the banker, in view of the truly vast trade possibilities which await us with the countries of the Orient which are friendly to us.

The people of the Orient, whatever else they may be, are unsurpassed in their sensitiveness. It is not to be presumed that they will hear that, in any part of the United States, humiliating discrimination is practised, solely because of race, without being disposed thereby to resent it. Their resentments are something to be reckoned with. They inspire a deeper and more continuing feeling than any hope for trade or commercial advancement. If there is conflict, I am persuaded that it will be, in the first case, free from physical violence. If the people of the Pacific Slope feel justified in discriminating against Japanese children, it is inevitable that Japan, by the very power of public opinion, will feel compelled to discriminate against the United States. What that may ultimately lead to, I do not care at present to contemplate; but, as I have intimated, the question is not a local one, it deeply concerns the entire American nation. If it is legally wrong for any State to grant charters that would render legislation in other States null and void, as the United States Supreme

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Court declares it to be wrong, it is certainly morally, if not legally, wrong for any State to adopt a policy which tends seriously to impair the friendly relations of the whole United States with a foreign nation. My only knowledge of international law is that which I have gained through a certain period of public service; but it seems to me that no State has a moral, and I doubt if it has a legal, right to adopt restrictive or discriminating legislation respecting a people or race, which is in conflict with the spirit of the fraternal treaty entered into between the United States and the Government of which these people are citizens.

When the people of the East repudiated and condemned the agitation against the European in the last century, their attitude was that of true American citizens. Time has shown how they were justified in their disapproval. But the principles they then upheld are the same on which our progress and prosperity are based to-day. The anti-Oriental movement on the Pacific Coast is directly opposed to these principles. Thus it seems to me that we would be false to our traditions if we did not insist that the wisdom of the mid-years of the last century, which prevailed, is also the wisdom of to-day; so that no race, as a race, is to be proscribed, to be discriminated against or to be humiliated.

THOMAS L. JAMES.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE WAR AGAINST CHRISTIANITY IN FRANCE.

BY ALGERNON SARTORIS.

It is a curious fact that one of the greatest revolutions in all history has been in progress, for the last few years, among the most enlightened and liberty-loving nation of Europe, without even the loss of a single life, and also, apparently, with the practical apathy of the vast majority of the population. As a result of this revolution, the greatest diplomatic achievement of the mightiest genius who ever presided over the destinies of any people has been overthrown by a set of mediocre statesmen, led by a renegade priest!

I refer, of course, to the treaty commonly known as the Concordat, signed between the representatives of General Bonaparte and of the Holy See. By means of this treaty, the Church and State in France have been enabled to live in peace and concord during seven different régimes. By this same treaty the temporal power was superior to, and controlled, the spiritual, but the Government of France recognized the necessity and utility of the spiritual influence of Christianity, and was the stronger on that account.

Even Robespierre and his bloodthirsty associates, while attempting to stifle Christianity, replaced it by decreeing the existence of a Supreme Being. The present Republic attempts to destroy Christianity, and what does it offer in return? Simply to save the money which used to be spent by the State in upholding not only the Roman Church, but also the Protestant and Jewish creeds, by the suppression of the Budget of Public Worship, and thus to lessen the burden of taxation! The legislators begin their economies with singular unanimity by voting an increase in their own salaries from $1,750 *per annum* to $3,000.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

This money will be partially paid from the funds which the violation of the Concordat, an odious offence against international law, will place in their hands. Not only is a sacred treaty violated, but a drastic, though liberal, law which came into force under the premiership of the late M. Waldeck-Rousseau is turned into an act of persecution against helpless women whose only crime was the nursing, free of charge, the wounded, the sick and the poor, and of many useful and industrious men—such as the fraternity of the Chartreux—who have been turned out of their homes, or the hospitals, or the camps of the soldiers because M. Emile Combes, Prime Minister of a great Republic, was afraid lest the gentle Sisters and good Brothers threatened the safety of France by devoting their lives to the service of God! Further, upon his head must be laid the pitiful end of some of these martyrs who died of cold in the mountains, wandering and destitute. It is only just to say that Waldeck-Rousseau himself, shortly before he died, horrified at the abuse of the law for which he was nominally responsible, denounced M. Combes, and stated clearly in a spirited speech that he had meant the law to be applied with sense and impartiality, and not with a brutality and petty spite unequalled in the annals of modern civilization.

A good example of the pettiness of spirit which animated Combes and his associates is found in the fact that he ordered the removal of the crucifixes from the law courts (itself an act of impiety and vandalism), but he also chose Good Friday for the execution of this order, thus unnecessarily wounding not only the susceptibilities of the Catholics, his avowed enemies, but also offering a gratuitous insult to every Christian in France. Under Combes (a renegade priest), the war against clericalism became a war against Christianity.

Another long and amplified law was passed in 1905, which purported to be a law of Separation; but it has fallen completely short of its intention, since Pius X has decided to ignore its provisions. The object of this Bill is, apparently, to supplant the Concordat, because, upon the violation of that instrument, France was no longer diplomatically represented at the Vatican. It also purported to give absolute freedom to the Church, but we have the word of M. Clémenceau himself that it is still full of the Concordatory spirit, and hence does not give full liberty of action to the Church. I have found, from personal inquiry amongst

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Catholics of all shades, of the clerical type and the liberal type, that an "honest separation" would have been welcomed heartily in every quarter. The new law, however, does not give that; but, under one form or another, makes the Church dependent on the good-will of the State, whilst depriving her of her treasury. I do not believe that the Catholics would object so strongly if they had not been so often deceived before. The example of the Waldeck-Rousseau law, as applied by a succeeding Ministry, is still too fresh to be forgotten. Monsieur Combes might again return to power, or rather the abuse of it, and find some ingenious way of turning what perhaps Messieurs Clémenceau and Briand render liberal and bearable into another law of spoliation, treachery and cruelty.

There are a great many Catholics in France who wish that the Holy Father had accepted the law; but, after due deliberation and prayer, the Supreme Pontiff issued a clear, dignified and careful statement, in strong contrast to the justificatory and violent vaporings of his opponents, in which he declared his outraged sense of the destructive work of the Republic, and forbade Catholics to accept a law that was founded on spoliation and violation of sacred treaties. Pius X even foresaw what came to pass, and stated what the reply of his enemies would be. He said that he knew that one of the chief arguments would be the inquiry, Why did he not accept in France what had been accepted in Germany? The answer would be, though he was too diplomatic to employ such forcible language, that the German Government could be relied on not to set aside obligations lightly, while the French Republic's policy had been one of continued deception and duplicity.

In vain did the Government under Combes attempt to shake the loyalty of the French Bishops by offering them the tempting bribe of its support, as well as material advantages, if they failed to obey the order to go to Rome; but, to their honor be it said, they were incorruptible. Even M. Briand, the present "areligious" (I use his own word) Minister of "Cultes," paid a grudging tribute to the fidelity of the Bishops in bowing to a decision in which they did not all agree, and which was bound to bring down much discomfort on their venerable heads.

It is somewhat difficult for Americans, to the great majority of whom Christianity is the foundation upon which their lives

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

are built, to understand exactly why a great and powerful Christian people should be indifferent to the attack upon the Christian Churches, and also why a Government supposed to be founded upon the principles of "Liberty, Equality and Fraternity" should desire to starve out—for this is what the suppression of the Budget of Public Worship really means—the Christian faith, by taking away its resources. There are two or three causes which contribute to this state of things. In the first place, the Roman Catholic Church is the only really powerful creed in the Republic. In a population of nearly 40,000,000, there are only 600,000 Protestants, who seem to follow that faith rather from geographical and traditional reasons than from other causes. Therefore, the history of the Roman Church in France is, to all intents and purposes, the history of Christianity in that country, and upon the maintenance of that Church Christianity in France depends, unless Protestantism should succeed it, a contingency which all students of political and religious history are of one mind in declaring to be impossible of realization. Unfortunately, it must be admitted that the French clergy, while living upright and honest lives, are drawn from a class which fails to represent the intellectual growth of the people. They are, as a whole, very narrow in their views, and they are, with but few exceptions, drawn from the ignorant peasant class and the class just above it. These men, quite unconsciously, often offend the sensibilities of those who are better educated by the narrowness of their vision. They abstain from reading any newspapers other than those printed especially for their edification. Knowing little themselves, they are unable to cope intellectually with their more cultured opponents. It is the custom of the old nobility to pose as the champions of the Church, but they do not enrich her priesthood with any drafts of recruits from their ranks; and it is just because the clergy have been duped by the championship of this feeble class, and led into supporting their dubious claims to rule, that they incurred the anger of vigorous men such as Gambetta, and of honest Republicans such as Waldeck-Rousseau. The "noblesse"—that is to say, the class which in England is known as the "aristocracy" and "landed gentry" combined, but which has no counterpart in the United States—has played a very miserable part in modern French history, and upon them must lie much of the blame, not only for the existence of the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

present very mediocre Government of France, but also for the dangerous apathy of the people towards religion in general. Their sins have been rather of omission than commission, rather of negligence than overzeal. As a class, they have rigidly avoided taking any active or even passive part in the political affairs of their country. Upon the ground that they do not care to mix with their social inferiors, they have neglected their duty to the State and thus lost the natural leadership acquired by centuries of rule, and which had become a tradition with the people. They live shut up in their châteaux, hunting or shooting, when they should be voting or working to improve the situation of the land; or else they live dissolute or innocuous lives in Paris, to the detriment of their morals and the disgust of the honest *bourgeois*. It was most unfortunate that the clergy and the clericals should have allied themselves with this justly discredited class when the Republic was formed. If France now suffers from misrule and is threatened with anarchy or radical socialism—and the two go together—it is the French aristocracy who are mainly responsible for this state of affairs. They have failed in their duty to the country.

Another cause for the discontent with the clergy is found, somewhat unjustly, in the Dreyfus case. There are two bogies which are used with great success, in all times of political excitement, to frighten the French people—namely, the Order of the Jesuits and Freemasonry. The French Freemasons are in no sense to be confounded with those of other lands. Indeed, the latter are forbidden to enter a French lodge; but, nevertheless, the disgraceful career of the Freemasons in France points to the danger of any secret society, however worthy its origin may be, degenerating into a political machine, with selfish purposes uppermost. In speaking of the French Jesuits, I may mention that, though they are an Order possessing many excellent qualities, their actions are often questionable and, indeed, their methods are not unlike those of the Freemasons themselves. Many good French people found it necessary to withdraw their sons from the influence of these men, whose system seems to be to implant in the minds of the young a dislike to liberty, either of thought or action, and hence a dislike to Republican institutions. There can be no doubt that this Order has brought much sorrow and trouble upon other religious communities by bringing down upon

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

them the hatred of the people, who do not stop to study the difference between one Order and another. The people think they have reason to dislike the Society of Jesus; the Society of Jesus is a religious Order: therefore, they hate all religious Orders. This is not very logical, but is a populace ever logical?

To return to the Dreyfus case; this "*cause célèbre*" so deeply affected the peace of France as to range family against family. It did, indeed, break up many homes which had hitherto been peaceful. The clergy, along with the vast majority of the people, certainly did, for the greater part, commit the error of taking violent sides against the pro-Dreyfusards; so, when finally justice triumphed over prejudice, and an innocent man, to the honor of the French Magistracy and, truth compels me to say also to the honor of the Socialists, was restored to his place in the army, the people, seeking a scapegoat, found it in the clergy, who had really erred no more than the majority of their countrymen; and, after all, priests are human.

It was a great pity for France, and for both the Church and the Republic, that Waldeck-Rousseau had to resign his office at a time when his impartial and just rule was needed for the safety of the land. His successor, Combes, instead of applying a liberal law with moderation, stirred up for political purposes all the hatred and violent passions the Dreyfus case had generated against the Church and embodied this into a law which suppressed the teaching Orders—and a more useful body of men it were difficult to find.

Under this same Minister, the Freemasons had full play. They set about destroying the strength of the country by wasting its substance. They had emissaries in the army who spied upon their superior officers, and it was considered a crime to simply attend Mass or even, in the case of Protestants, to go to church. General André, a Freemason, was made Minister of War. This creature set about "republicanizing" the army by employing his Masonic associates to act the spy and by means of the now-famous "*fiches*" to inform him who were clericals and who were not. The preference was always to be given to the man who denied Christ. Happily, this disgusted the nation when it was discovered, and André was forced into an innocuous retirement, from which it is to be hoped he will not emerge again.

It became a dangerous thing at this time for any official to

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

publicly profess faith in Christianity. The list of petty persecutions would fill volumes, and though to-day these have abated, still the war against Christianity is going on.

The idea of the Government is to gradually stamp Christianity out of France, by suppressing the various means the Church has of maintaining its organization. The feeling against clericalism has been changed to one against Christianity. A Department not long ago asked the central Government to remove the motto still printed on the coins of the Republic, "God protect France," since, they said, "there was no scientific proof of the existence of Deity." There is a bill now pending to put this request into force, and there is not much opposition to it.

Thus, at the beginning of a new century, the Government of a great and powerful people, a people who have led the world hitherto in art, science, war; whose place in literature is second to none; who, as a curious coincidence, have waged great wars for the propagation and maintenance of the doctrines of Christ, suddenly turns and attempts to destroy by every means in its power the name and teachings of Christ. We have heard the Prime Minister openly jeer at the Scriptures. We have seen M. Briand, in an address of recognized ability, speak of the Government as being "areligious," or without religion, a declaration which was looked upon as "liberal" and "moderate" by the greater part of the people. The natural question is, Will it succeed? The times seem very dark and troubled. The apathy of the masses to this awful transformation fills me with dread; but, on the other hand, the clergy, if not broad, are good and faithful; they are used to persecution, and persecution always generates heroes and martyrs. There are still Christians in France; and, in the light of past history, we know how, when all the power of the Empire of Rome was used to strangle the little following of Jesus, it only succeeded in stimulating the growth of the benign religion it sought to suppress. And I firmly believe that, in the end, the French people will discover that they are following a false path, and that, when they learn that that path ends in darkness and moral obloquy and despair, they will throw over their false leaders, as they did Robespierre and others of his ilk, feeling more strongly than ever the necessity of acknowledging in one form or another the teaching of our Lord Jesus Christ.

ALGERNON SARTORIS.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

PROGRESS AND PROSPECTS OF ESPERANTO.

BY JOSEPH RHODES, F.J.I., MEMBER OF THE LINGVA KOMITATO, AND VICE-PRESIDENT OF THE BRITISH ESPERANTO ASSOCIATION.

A GOOD deal of water has flowed down the Vistula since the appearance of Dr. "Esperanto's" little pamphlet at Warsaw in June, 1887, and there is so much to be told of the nature and diffusion of Dr. Zamenhof's auxiliary international language, to say nothing of the 150 abortive projects that preceded it, as to make it difficult to decide where to begin, and less easy still to know where to leave off. The limits of the present article forbid, at all events, any dealing with Esperanto from the grammatical or illustrative point of view.

The story has already been told how the internecine quarrels among the four sharply separated communities of his native Bialystok — Russians, Poles, Germans and Jews — stirred the soul of the young Jewish dreamer, Louis Lazarus Zamenhof, and how, after gaining a working knowledge of several European and classic languages, he set himself to devise a secondary tongue, not by the *a priori* method of a Psalmanazar or the inventor of a system of shorthand, but by basing a system upon the observed tendencies of civilized nations. And after years of effort, sustained by the hope and confidence that he was laboring not only for the good of his neighbors, but of the wider world without, his tiny bark was launched on the sea of public criticism.

Russia, the birthland of Esperanto, is hardly a soil on which an artificial language could be expected to thrive, if only for the reason of the lamentably small percentage of the population who can read and write. And the veto of the censor is another factor with which the setter-forth of new projects has to reckon. The publication in the little magazine "Esperantist" of a commendatory opinion by Tolstoy led to the discontinuance of the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

monthly, which reappeared the same year (1895) at Upsala as "Lingvo Internacia," and after a transfer to Hungary it continues from Paris its useful career as a fortnightly.

The movement grew in Sweden, where it has had some of its steadiest and most hard-working adherents. Austria, not long before the scene of ardent Volapükist propaganda, took up the cause, but all previous efforts were put into the shade by the activity which developed in France. Here a young French marquis —with a touching romance of his own—who has been content to be known as plain Monsieur Louis de Beaufront, became so struck with the superior merits of Esperanto over those of the unpublished "Adjuvanto" upon which, and along strikingly similar lines, he had labored hard for a dozen years, that he cheerfully laid aside the child of his own brain and enrolled himself under Dr. Zamenhof's banner. He entered the field at a time when the energies and hopes of the tiny pioneer band seemed almost spent, and but for de Beaufront it is hardly too much to say that little would be heard of Esperanto to-day.

A third name deserves mention in this connection. In the published list, or "Adresaro," of the names of the first 1,000 persons who signified in writing to Dr. Zamenhof their intention of learning Esperanto there are only eleven British or American names, the United States being represented by two—Adam C. Orr, of Park Ridge, Illinois, and Henry Phillips, Secretary of the American Philosophical Society, 320 South Eleventh Street, Philadelphia. The place of honor must be accorded to Mr. Geoghegan. The son of a Dublin physician, he was born in 1865, and a misfortune which inflicted on him, while a mere child, a permanent lameness seems to have stimulated his mental powers, for he early showed a fondness for languages, and was led to turn his attention to Chinese. He attracted the notice of the late Professor Jowett, of Oxford, under whose patronage he entered Balliol College, Oxford, and fully justified the hopes which had been formed of him, for he carried off two of the Exhibitions in Chinese, only to find that, after all, his lameness proved a bar to entrance into the Chinese Civil Service. After joining his brothers on the Pacific coast he added stenography to his acquirements, and learned Japanese, while for six years secretary to Count Saito, Japanese Consul at Puget Sound. From later service at the British Vice-Consulates at Tacoma and Seattle,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Mr. Geoghegan became official reporter of the Federal Court of Alaska, and since 1903 most of his time and efforts have been devoted to his official duties in that remote and somewhat frigid possession of the Union.

It is to Mr. Geoghegan that we owe our earliest English translation of Dr. Zamenhof's instruction-book. Subsequently he translated a rather fuller handbook from the German of Herr Trompeter, a second edition of the brochure being issued later on from Upsala. Mr. Geoghegan tells how his own introduction to Esperanto was through an article in the "St. James's Gazette," and that a letter in Latin to Dr. Zamenhof brought back a German instruction-book. The writer of these lines gained his first knowledge, in November, 1900, from a French manual printed in Nüremberg, and amplified it by Geoghegan's second or third booklet—a pretty fair illustration of the internationality of the new language!

The first British organization was The Esperanto Society for the Study and Dissemination of Esperanto among English-speaking Peoples, founded by the writer and a few friends at Keighley —a Yorkshire industrial borough midway between London and Edinburgh—on November 7th, 1902. London formed its Club in January, 1903, and since then the progress of the cause has been steady. Much of this has been due, without doubt, to the powerful help of a monthly column in "The Review of Reviews," and a series of paragraphs in the language which have appeared in the "Daily News." Sixty-eight groups and societies with a similar aim have been formed not only in many parts of the Kingdom, but in the colonies and dependencies, including Canada (Winnipeg), Malta, India, Australia and New Zealand. The foundation of "The Esperantist" at a meeting held at Mr. W. T. Stead's house, and subsequently its incorporation with "The British Esperantist," have also been powerful aids to propaganda and unification of effort. The establishment, October 14th, 1904, of the British Esperanto Association gave the national movement a focus, and its creation of an Examination Board has made it possible to offer some kind of guarantee that the holders of its higher diploma have shown something more than a cursory knowledge of the language they may be teaching. The President of the British Esperanto Association, Lieutenant-Colonel Pollen —a name suggestive of fruitful propaganda—is an Irish barrister

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

of extensive linguistic attainments, who effectively points to Hindustani, the regularized camp-jargon of Akbar's armies, as in itself a precedent for the success and usefulness of an artificial language.

Canada made a bold start in 1902, and was doing a grand work from Montreal when typographical difficulties connected with the accented letters and the Linotype machine led to the discontinuance of "La Lumo," and the cessation for a time of the propaganda there. It is hoped, however, that the awakening of the United States to the advantages of Esperanto will call her neighbor to resume a mission, commenced by Mr. Beauchemin, Mr. Saint-Martin and other devoted workers, in which she showed such promising initiative.

Among the latest countries to join the movement come the United States, and others will be better able to tell how the few scattered early disciples of Dr. Zamenhof throughout the Union have been welded into an active phalanx as a consequence of the visit of an eminent German scholar to Harvard. The whole "Esperantistaro" is looking on with eager interest at this new development among the English-speaking peoples, and hoping large things from the go-ahead character of the younger and more vigorous Western branch.

Last, but possibly not the least important in point of ultimate influence, the Japanese are taking up Esperanto with an enthusiasm that promises to furnish an object-lesson alike to the Esperanto world and the indifferent outside it. The agglutinative character of the language is a strong recommendation to natives of the Far East, who find it difficult to master a Western speech, so different is it from their own in word-formation and syntax. The new instruction-book for Japanese lies before the writer, as also a copy of the excellently printed Japanese-Esperanto magazine. Alongside them is a well-constructed post-card from a Japanese correspondent who tells how 400 of his college companions are studying the language, and that he believes the number in Japan cannot be less than 2,000. It is the turn of China next. The first drop in the future rainfall came in the shape of a letter to the Keighley Society from far-off Lung Chow, somewhere about 1,000 miles west of Pekin, whence an official in the Chinese Customs, one Sung Sik, begged the privilege of membership in the English society.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Statistically considered, up to June, 1906, Esperanto was known to have penetrated to 31 countries, and 377 societies or groups were at work, Europe being credited with 349, America with 16 —the United States having then 10 societies in 7 centres—Asia with 7, Africa with 3, and Oceania with 2. To give a census of Esperantists is impossible, but a recent moderate guess at their number is 300,000. There are also 31 professional societies or organizations using Esperanto for special objects, 28 Esperanto magazines, in which the national language appears side by side with the international, and 8 national periodicals containing a regular Esperanto column. Europe is, so far, the centre of gravity, and here the societies are distributed: France, 94; Great Britain, 64; Germany, 35; Austria-Hungary, 28; Switzerland, 22; Russia and Spain, 21 each; Bulgaria and Sweden, 15 each; Belgium, 14; Holland, 7; Denmark and Malta, 3 each; and Monaco, 1.

It may now be useful to consider the prospects of Esperanto with regard to its fitness for the demands which will be made on any international language, and with regard to its prospects of success.

The writer frankly cannot lay claim to any special qualification to speak on the former point, except so far as a thirty years' journalistic experience, a tolerable acquaintance with French, and some special study of the subject of artificial languages, added to an extensive experience of spoken Esperanto, may be admitted as titles in this behalf.

As to the first point, then, Dr. Zamenhof's labors have been conducted throughout in a scientific spirit, guided by an uncommon endowment of common sense. If genius is evinced as often by the defter use than ordinary of every-day materials, as by startling novelties, the author of Esperanto is entitled to rank. Any twenty-foot craft may now discover America, but a Columbus—or was it the Norseman Leif, the son of Eric the Red?—had to show how it could be done. And so it was left to Zamenhof to show the world how a common language might be built up of familiar materials. In his "Universala Vortaro" of 2,600 roots expressive of what may be termed fundamental ideas a person of neo-Latin speech would recognize from 36 to 60 per cent.; one of Teutonic origin, including English, 30 per cent.; and a Slav, 28 per cent. And an exceptionless grammar so tiny

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

that a scholar could master it in an hour or so rounds off a language that defies competition on the score of facility. And what bids fair to insure vitality for the system is that the "roots" have suffered so little disturbance in their transplantation that they can continue their natural growth and obey the laws which govern language no less than do other living organisms. But just as the gardener directs and restrains the processes of growth, so as to insure the maximum of symmetry and beauty, so Dr. Zamenhof, at the request of the First Universal Congress of Esperantists held at Boulogne-sur-Mer in 1905, has set up a *Lingva Komitato* which will perform for the language itself the office of an Academy, only the more effectually that its labors commence with the beginning rather than the maturity of Esperanto.

And the language itself, with its ingenious equipment of affixes, has such an inherent power of word-building that the finest shades of meaning may be expressed. The Esperanto experts, indeed, find themselves in possession of an instrument whose potentialities stretch out before them like a Newtonian ocean; and it will only be when a Shakespeare or a Dante comes into or grows up within the movement that the possibilities of this euphonious instrument can be adequately explored.

There is a large class of persons friendly to Esperanto and even enthusiastic on its behalf who, from a failure to appreciate the ancestry and high lineage of the language, feel a shiver down the spine if one ventures in the same breath to mention the sacred word "literature." While granting that Esperanto may serve for securing bed and breakfast at some French auberge, ordering a few casks of wine from Burgundy, bales of cotton from Texas, or lumber from Duluth, these good people resent the idea that such a hotchpotch of a language is fit for literary expression. It were wisdom to be careful before advancing such an objection too hastily, for that might lead to some awkward questions as to how our own hotchpotch tongue has come into being, or why a language which selects the excellencies of several should necessarily be inferior to any of them. It may, perhaps, be conceded that no translation into another tongue can in every minute particular give a photographically exact portrait of the original, and Esperanto must ultimately be judged by the original matter produced in it; but the "literary" objector may

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

be invited to study the language for himself, to see how it has served for the translation of three Shakespearean plays, a couple of Byron's dramas, portions of the "Iliad" and the "Æneid" and Schiller's "Tell"; and how scientific and medical subjects are handled in the "Scienca Revuo" and the "Medicina Revuo." Such a course of investigation is calculated to convince the objector that one's philosophy may usefully widen its area with benefit to the judgment. The "ugly duckling" sometimes turns out to be a swan.

But leaving this debatable ground out of view, Esperanto in its application to trade and commerce has already opened out a wide field of usefulness, and it would be difficult to exaggerate the possibilities of the service it will render to the nations when once the value of such an instrument has been realized. The writer has operated—though only in an experimental scale—in soap with a Paris house before the English Soap Trust or Combine blew its little bubble; he has sampled the real attar of roses from the Kezanlik valley; might have stored his cellars with claret innocent of logwood, had he not been a teetotaler, or furnished a smoking-cabinet with the best brierwood pipes from Upper Savoy; and he carried out a negotiation with a Russian jeweller in the Baltic Provinces. He was consulted by an inventive Frenchman in Algeria as to submitting to an English firm of fishing-tackle makers an ingeniously devised snare for inshore fish; assisted an English colleague in a transaction in stationery for a Russian or Greek banker in Teheran; and replied to a correspondent near Moscow who was interested in English leather. All these were conducted in the one international medium, Esperanto, between parties for the most part ignorant of each other's language. One may see from month to month in the national Esperanto magazines advertisements relating to girders and roofing, to typewriters and dried fish, to thief-resisting locks and patent medicaments, to special brands of whiskeys or electrotherapy; and firms anxious to extend the area of their business are having translated into Esperanto their price-lists of photographic apparatus, of weaving appliances and other productions. Technical dictionaries are always of slow growth, but several special vocabularies have already been issued in Esperanto. During the recent General Congress one enterprising Swiss printer had an attractive little

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

handbook printed in Esperanto to induce visitors to prolong their stay among the beauties of the Bernese Oberland. A devoted colleague, Mr. J. Ellis, has carried through an important legal commission in England for French clients in Esperanto.

One remarkable utilization of Esperanto, which alone would justify its creation, has been its impressment into service for the international blind. Already the sightless of various countries had had ample reason to bless the memory of Braille, whose six-dot radical has brought within their touch so many of the joys of literature. But here, again, the barrier of language has been doubly difficult to surmount. A few of the extra-alphabetical signs, diversely used as logograms by the different countries, have been applied to the accented letters of the Esperanto alphabet, and now the blind have their national instruction-books in the raised dots, and an international magazine, "The Ligilo" (The Tie, or Bond of Union), six times a year, which, with one expense of production, serves the whole international "blindularon." Well might a blind Swiss voice the thanks of the sightless at the Geneva Congress, and two blind women express, in his own melodious accents, their gratitude to Dr. Zamenhof for the rays of light and cheer he has caused to stream so pleasantly into darkened lives.

A good deal depends, in the case of an "artificial" language —which is, of course, nobody's mother tongue—upon the extent to which it is taken up by educationists, and encouraged by the authorities. France has given a striking lead, for not only have the soldiers and marines received special permission to attend Esperanto classes, but the University authorities in several districts have consented to the inclusion of Esperanto as a class subject. The language is to form the subject of an important motion in the Chamber of Deputies with regard to its general official recognition.

In Great Britain, if the progress has been slower, the elementary and secondary teachers are taking up the personal study of Esperanto very freely, and great hopes are being built on the forthcoming Third International Esperanto Congress, to be held at Cambridge in August next, as to its effect on the attitude of the Universities to the language. Then, also, the Board of Education has recognized the pioneer work of Keighley by extending provisional sanction to the classes which the writer is conducting

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

in the Municipal Technical Institute. At Burnley, also, Esperanto is admitted as a grant-earning subject in the evening classes, and the Board of Education is being literally bombarded with applications for recognition from all parts of the country.

Another factor of very great moment is the inclusion of Esperanto by the London Chamber of Commerce in their curriculum side by side with modern languages, and the encouragement afforded by the London County Council evening Esperanto classes. And now that one hears of Prince Oscar, of Norway, and the Queen of Spain being taught Esperanto, it really seems as if the language threatens to become fashionable.

With regard to the spoken use of Esperanto it is hardly necessary to fill space with an enumeration of the many striking services it has rendered to the traveller. The writer has spent his holidays during the past four years on the Continent with a slender equipment of spoken French which he has rarely needed to unpack, while Esperanto has served all occasions. He has had most pleasurable sojourns with "samideanoj"—delightful word, translatable to its nearest power by the expression "like-minded ones"—in Havre, in the leading Esperantist centres of Belgium, at Boulogne and in Geneva, and has found everywhere that the international language has made of him a "citizen of the world."

At Geneva he had the pleasure of meeting with Messrs. Grillon and Lüders, of Philadelphia, from whom he received very encouraging reports of the reception that the language is meeting in America, and he assured them of the warm sympathy of Esperantists in the "old country."

In conversation with Esperantists from many different lands it was interesting to note how little variation is to be found in the pronunciation of a language which President Roosevelt may note is strictly phonetic. One occasionally met, it is true, with a Frenchman who placed a little extra stress on the last syllable of a word instead of on the penultimate, or a Slav who betrayed the same tendency with regard to the first syllable, but these were scarcely noticeable, and certainly one never found anything like the variety observable between an Englishman from a northern county and another from a southern.

All the business proceedings of the Congress, and the many side gatherings of special interests — Pacificists, Red Socialists, Chess-players, Mathematicians (in room "X"), Geologists, Ro-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

man Catholics, Protestants and Lawyers — were conducted in Esperanto, and that business was effected with a lucidity and a despatch that many national assemblies might envy. It was the same at the social functions, the theatrical representations and the lectures—facility and intelligibility were the leading notes. How different this from the ordinary procedure and experience of international congresses! It was the intense feeling of the necessity of doing something to facilitate business at such gatherings, becoming year by year more numerous, that led to the formation, at the Paris Exhibition in 1900, of the "Delegation for the Adoption of an Auxiliary International Language,"* and since then the Committee of the Delegation has been approaching the learned of all countries with a view of obtaining their support to its programme. Which is, in brief, to urge upon the International Association of Academies the duty of examining and recommending for adoption some one language for international use as a secondary tongue. Such a language, it is seen, must (1) be capable of serving the needs of the ordinary intercourse of social life, of commercial communications and of scientific and philosophical relations; (2) be easily acquired by every person of average education, and especially by persons of European civilization; and (3) it must not be one of the national languages. The memorial in this behalf is being extensively signed by the learned bodies of Europe.

There is no room to discuss the reasons here for the discarding of any national tongue, but a last word will be to urge the American Esperantists to do their part to insure that the choice of an international language cannot possibly fall elsewhere than upon Esperanto.

* Secretary: L. Leau, Docteur ès Sciences, 6 Rue Vavin, Paris, VI.

JOSEPH RHODES.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

"THE FUTURE IN AMERICA."*

BY JOSEPH S. AUERBACH.

Omne tulit punctum qui miscuit utile dulci,
Lectorem delectando pariterque monendo.
Hic meret aera liber Sociis; hic et mare transit
Et longum noto scriptori prorogat ævum.

HORACE.

MR. WELLS has done important literary work, appreciation of which must increase as time goes on; but he has done nothing which so clearly entitles him to a prominent place among the distinguished men of letters as his "Future in America," issued from the press of Harper & Brothers. Whether we consider its substance or its form, it would be difficult, if not impossible, to name another author equally well equipped to produce such a book. His stay in this country was short, but the two chapters written before he reached America—one in his study in England, and one on the ocean—indicate how complete was his preparation for a correct interpretation of our problems and so-called progress, with which, although he had been free of actual and interested contact, he had, nevertheless, been intimately identified in their intellectual and economic and spiritual import. Accordingly, we have a work of rare merit and absorbing interest, though the charm and effect of a graceful, vigorous style are distinctly marred by the "isn'ts" and "don'ts and "haven'ts" and other similarly irritating colloquialisms appearing so persistently on many pages.

To turn from the discussion by the demagogue of the problems that are confronting us, to this book, is like coming from a foul tunnel into the exhilarating atmosphere of a bracing day.

Its views may not minister to our vanity, but it ought to have

* "The Future in America." By H. G. Wells.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

a wide influence with us as a people. There would be no doubt about its having such influence, if we did not so much exaggerate the importance of the views of the so-called practical man—whose judgment is rarely based on contemplation, but is often warped by interest or excessive activity—that we are disposed to neglect the best counsel of the worthy men of letters. For the world of ideas and the world of activities lie close together, and, sooner or later, there will be some just appraisement of our legacy from great authors — not alone from the standpoint of mere literary excellence, but of the immediate relation of their writings to a correct disposition of social and economic ills. Then we shall appreciate infinitely more than we do to-day the value of what these men of letters have done for the well-being of the world, and shall realize that while many others have been seeking, like economic quacks, to deal with the symptoms of a disease, it is they who have given wise but often rejected counsel for its complete eradication. And men like Emerson, and Arnold, and now Wells—for this book entitles him to an intellectual kinship with them in the expression of great truths about us—have more knowledge of our true condition than we are inclined even to conjecture.

Fortunately, the "Future in America" has appeared at the period of our disillusionment, when what Mr. Wells terms our egotistical interest in our own past is at an end. Now, if ever, we should be prepared to receive such a book without irritation and perhaps with a distinct welcome.

The "Spectator," in a comment full of crudities and contradictions, has reviewed the book somewhat unfavorably; but, apparently, the "Spectator" has volunteered to see to it that nothing from an English source critical of American institutions shall pass unrebuked. It mistakes, however, the present temper of the American mind, which is no longer solicitous for adulation, but is seeking and insisting upon true enlightenment and guidance as it gropes its way through its labyrinth of doubts and difficulties. And to apply the term "caricature," as does the "Spectator," to the splendid picture Mr. Wells presents, with its extended horizons and true perspective, its fine spiritual coloring, and with only such detail as serves to emphasize its proportions, evinces for us a lack of that frankness which is the true test of friendship, while from the intellectual standpoint the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

characterization is a close approach to unpardonable nonsense. Yet the "Spectator," with an inconsistency of which it seems quite unconscious, admits that Mr. Wells has produced a "remarkable book," and that "no bird's-eye view of a nation that we know has a keener imaginative insight." Fortunately, however, full justice is done to Mr. Wells in England by Mr. Sydney Brooks's scholarly and appreciative review of the book.

Aside from a startling clairvoyance, so to speak, which enables Mr. Wells to see our problems in their relative importance and to point out the peculiarities of our existing and threatening difficulties, one of the chief attractions of his book is the absence of anything like an attempt to dogmatize about us; and he often doubts the accuracy of his own impressions, leaving to us the answer to many of the questions he has asked, though the answer is often but too obvious. His playful fancy, characteristic of so much of his other writings, does not desert him, nor is there wanting a certain grim humor centring largely about our "spike-crowned" Statue of Liberty, that, dwarfed by the sky-scraping commercial structures forming its background, suggests to him something of the regard in which hitherto in our national life we have held liberty in comparison with trade and commerce.

What he believes to be our failure to live close to high ideals in business does not escape his notice; but then he considers this a condition in no way peculiar to us, and he is of the opinion that business, for the most part, is without high ideals; and his views generally as to the natural effect of excessive devotion to the pursuit of trade will not weary the reader with platitudes. Even for the "much-reviled" Mr. Rockefeller, who, in so much of the newspaper discussion of the day, is put down as the incarnation of all that is evil and unprincipled in business methods, he confesses to a "sneaking liking," recognizing in him almost an unconscious product of a glut of opportunity; and he thinks if the product had not been Mr. Rockefeller, it would have been some one else suspiciously like him. From his standpoint, Mr. Rockefeller is not the criminal; but the thing criminal is the economic and industrial cut-throat game, which—with the little children of the factory and the sweat-shop among its pitiable victims—he considers we have made in part our national occupation.

He regards as comparatively of trivial and negligible importance in our national life "things like the Chicago scandals, the

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

insurance scandals and all the manifest crudities of the American spectacle." He knows well enough that as a matter of self-preservation men cannot permit such things to have any abiding-place in a community. Long ago Fisher Ames uttered this truth:

> "If there could be a resurrection at the foot of the gallows; if the victims of public justice could live again, unite and form themselves into a society, they would find themselves constrained, however loath, to adopt the very principles of that justice by which they suffered, as the fundamental law of their State."

The insistence upon honesty in such cases is not a virtue, it is merely a policy. Penal Codes do not furnish the foundation on which a great nation's life can be reared.

This, too, should be added, that much in our method of announcing these scandals is itself scandalous. Some wrongdoing there doubtless has been; yet, as Mr. Wells says, "graft is no American specialty." It appears everywhere in the world in spots and places, but the moral sense of the men of this country who are making its true and enduring history is sound and wholesome. And in default of the whipping-post, there should be the appropriate social or business or political outlawry for those who, in high or low places, are to our lasting shame blazoning forth to the world the untruthful and repulsive assertion that a great body of American citizens are afflicted with a loathsome disease —the contagious itch for other people's property.

Quite apart from such things he sees our real dangers. He looks for disastrous consequences from the unwisdom of inviting to our shores, without any attempt at discrimination, an immigration which does not impress him "as an influx of energetic people, of economically independent settlers, . . . but in the main as an importation of laborers increasingly alien to the native tradition"; and he adds some valuable suggestions for the avoidance of this menace. Dr. Darlington, the health officer of New York City, in a most thoughtful article in a late issue of THE NORTH AMERICAN REVIEW, says something quite similar as to the quality and character of our present immigration. Nor can we ask for any more impressive comment upon our perfunctory insistence that the suffrage will elevate these people than Mr. Wells's words: "The immigrants are being given votes, I know; but that does not free them, it only enslaves the country. The negroes were given votes."

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Then, with keen insight, he points out how, in association with the momentous consequences of this immigration, we are summoned to deal with the pathetic and ominous problem presented by our great and increasing colored population, that he terms the "Tragedy of Color." He cannot be said to have any specific remedy for this ill, but he does not think there is much admixture of the true American spirit in our treatment of it. He excuses himself, but many will think he needs no excuse for idealizing the dark, submissive figure of the negro in this spectacle of America, who seems to him to "sit waiting—and waiting with a marvellous and simple-minded patience—for finer understandings and a nobler time." And if the negro problem does not appeal to our sense of justice, it ought at least to teach us the prudence of not adding to it the further menace of fresh and unrestricted importations of an inferior population, which he is confident cannot be assimilated into our citizenship. Our hurry and disposition to "step lively" furnish him with evidence of our disregard of much which must be a part of a nation's creed and practice, if it would realize its ideals. As typical of our contradictory extremes, he found Chicago squalid and joined to its idols of acquisition, "smoky, vast and undisciplined"; but in even such an environment there were not wanting evidences of a moral awakening that in all communities of the world is groping its way upward; while Boston, with all its intellectual virtues, impressed him as "cultured, but uneventful," and without leadership or even an appropriate interest in the struggle to solve the great problems of to-day. At such a time as the present he has no tolerance with the "immense effect of finality" of Boston. He was distinctly disappointed in not finding what he looked for in Washington, a "clearing-house of thought."

In the world at large he recognizes some national conditions not radically different from ours; and though he sees them magnified here, because all our activities are so impressive in their vastness, he points out, as did Arnold, how this very vastness may bring to us the sense of our solemn responsibility to ourselves and to the world. But he is of the view that our political degradation, the lack of a "curb upon our lust of acquisition," and what he terms our "State blindness," are among the faults peculiar to ourselves. And, if it had been permitted to him to continue his investigation further, he would not have

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

failed to see startling evidences of our proneness to condone political transgression, the beneficiaries and even the perpetrators of which so often escape unrebuked.

By State blindness he does not mean a lack of patriotism in feeling or expression, but a disposition to look upon our activities and conduct as absolute things affecting only ourselves or our immediate surroundings, when, in fact, they must be looked at in their relation to the common good of the State. It will profit us to read without irritation, but with deep thoughtfulness, this startling statement, which a candid but friendly critic of us feels justified in making:

> "Patriotism has become a mere national self-assertion, a sentimentality of flag-cheering with no constructive duties. Law, social justice, the pride and preservation of the State as a whole, are taken as provided for before the game began, and one devotes oneself to business. At business all men are held to be equal, and none is his brother's keeper."

To the catalogue of our dangers he adds our tolerance of, if not our sympathy with, the injustice of mere public clamor, a certain "flash of harshness" and an "accompanying contempt for abstract justice." He wishes, however, to regard this as an "accident of the commercial phase that presses men beyond dignity, patience and magnanimity," and is "loath to believe it is something fundamentally American." Yet, when he cites to our shame the instances of McQueen and Gorky, though he refrains from much injurious comment, he offers no excuse for our conduct.

He sees in the greedy acquisition of vast wealth and its vulgar display, and in the centralization and concentration of that wealth and of our organized industry within an increasingly few hands, more than the beginnings of the collapse of our much-vaunted individual competition and the equal opportunity for all. It is apparent to him that our economic process has begun to grind living men as well as inanimate matter. And he notes the ominous mutterings of a disapproval that will not be mute, even though it must speak with the economic jargon of the demagogue. It is no longer a case of our avoiding or stifling the debate, but of the substitution of wise counsels for intemperate utterance and for possibly intemperate acts; and by wise counsels is meant the introduction into our conceptions of our national life of many considerations we have up to the present time ignored.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

All of us frequently hear expressions of surprise at the appearance of this disapproval at a time when the evidences of material prosperity confront us everywhere. Yet we must not forget that, fortunately, the American people think as well as eat; and it is a hopeful sign for the future that their consciences and intellects cannot be drugged with the "full dinner-pail."

By this it is not meant to suggest that all or even the larger part of this disapproval is justified. On the contrary, much of it is superficial or manufactured by men with evil or interested motives; much of it is full of crudities. Yet, when all this is said, it remains true that at the present time there is flowing through this and other lands a great stream of influence to which, accordingly as men view from different standpoints the contributions it has received from its many sources, they have applied the several names of "discontent," "unrest," "socialism," "humanitarianism" and "a great spiritual awakening." Whatever be its proper characterization, only our folly can persuade us that this influence in the world will, or that it is wise that it should, utterly disappear. On the contrary, if indications count for anything, it gains in depth and volume as it sweeps on, and threatens to undermine the foundation of many things whose security we have until now regarded as beyond menace. Nor, as some think, can its current be dammed; for through or over any obstruction placed in its way it is likely one day to rush with even more disastrous consequences. What appears to many of us, superficially viewed, merely as a meaningless or destructive agency, can be utilized for good; for, just as men by directing the course of mighty rivers into countless channels have turned deserts into fertile lands, so we, with this influence, can perhaps restore to usefulness the places in our national life laid waste by selfishness, neglect and the lack of regard for those things which concern the welfare of our neighbor and the State.

Mr. Wells does not write in despair of our future; and, despite our shortcomings, and despite his patriotic views of his own country, and his belief in the preeminence in certain directions of Germany, he inclines to the conviction that "the leadership of progress must remain with us"; and that if we fail, ours will not be an isolated failure, but a failure of the realization of great ideals of all the world, destined, as we are, perhaps, to express the final judgment of mankind as to the experiment of a democracy.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The doubts that existed in his mind, when he came to America, were largely resolved in our favor while he was in the midst of our excitement and rush and a part of our "step-lively" brigade, but back again in his study by the sea, where he writes the last, as he wrote the first portion of his book, his doubts recur, reinforced somewhat by later reflections.

He believes, however, that true friendship is shown to the American people not by concealing, but by indicating, the dangers that threaten us, which are many and conspicuous to the observer, who, by reflection and contemplation, sees them in their true perspective and proportions. We have not, as he points out, the problem confronting Great Britain, of holding together a vast and extended empire, and we are not, as are the other countries of Europe, to use his language, weighed down with the armor of war. In our legal entanglements, which perhaps he may emphasize too much—but in the other things he refers to that cannot be too much emphasized—in our persistent and reckless affirmation by word and deed that individualism is a thing to be worshipped; in our excessive devotion or yielding to the exacting demands of a material progress that precludes the continuous exercise of our highest intelligence and best thought; in our lack of appreciation that our acts have a relation other than to ourselves; in the absence among us of a social environment that enjoins a discipline of respect for a governing class or for some appropriate substitute, and of a national tradition that insists upon a high sense of responsibility to the State; and in our vast and irresponsible new immigration and in our colored population —in all these things he finds conditions requiring that the loins even of a great people like ours be girded up for a struggle in whose issue not only we, but all the world, have a momentous interest.

Perhaps, on the whole, it may be said that, with his passionate belief in an intelligence which insures the irresistible progress of mankind, his conclusions concerning us are not essentially different from those of Emerson, who—though he refers in plain speech to

"our great sensualism, our headlong devotion to trade, our extravagant confidence in our talent and activity, which becomes, whilst successful, a scornful materialism, but with the fault, of course, that it has no depth, no reserve force to fall back upon when a reverse comes,"

nevertheless believes that with us

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

"there is even an inspiration, God knows whence; a sudden undated perception of eternal right coming into and correcting things that were wrong, a perception that passes through thousands as readily as through one."

Nor are his conclusions essentially different from those of Arnold that, in the world at large,

"in spite of all that is said about the absorbing and brutalizing influence of passionate material progress, it seems to me that this progress is likely, though not certain, to lead in the end to an apparition of intellectual life."

Fortunately for our present safety, and for our future creative work in the world, we are, as Mr. Wells views us, feverish with desire for trustworthy information as to our whereabouts and true destination. Though he believes that we have drifted far from our true course, he realizes that our voyage has been over unknown seas, without the possession of the delicate instruments of tradition and contemplation for the taking of observations, and without beacons on the shore to warn us of dangers; and that, therefore, we have been obliged to cover great distances in our national life by mere dead-reckoning. But he does not wish to believe that we have yet made, or shall make, shipwreck of our own hopes and of the hopes of mankind.

Carlyle says of our harsh, cruel judgment of men who err:

"Granted, the ship comes into harbor with shrouds and tackle damaged; the pilot is blameworthy; he has not been all-wise and all-powerful; but to know *how* blameworthy, tell us first whether his voyage has been round the globe or only to Ramsgate and the Isle of Dogs."

And Burns, on whose behalf he pleads, has said, in verse that is immortal:

"What's *done* we partly may compute,
But know not what's *resisted*."

So we who have the doubts, but also the hopes, of Mr. Wells wish to believe, and in large measure have persuaded ourselves to believe, that here in America, in the fulness of time, there will be reared that new State—with its realization of something akin to a perfected citizenship, with its creed of intelligence and with altars raised to the worship of great truths and of righteousness; where for offences against the standards of right conduct there shall be a swifter condemnation in the Court of Conscience

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

than there is punishment for violations of criminal statutes in the courts of law; and where to the imagination of men there shall rise in the midst of these harmonious surroundings not a dwarfed statue, but a noble and commanding monument to liberty, from whose lofty summit there shall, for us and all the world, shine forth with increasing splendor the light of a true civilization — that ideal State for which mankind has watched and prayed, and of whose certain coming Mr. Wells and other great authors, in their creative writings, have given prophetic utterance.

It will be difficult, indeed, for the American people to discharge the great debt of gratitude they owe to Mr. Wells.

JOSEPH S. AUERBACH.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

FRANCE'S TRIBUTE TO FULTON'S MEMORY.

BY HENRY BAYER, SPECIAL COMMISSIONER OF THE INTERNATIONAL MARITIME EXPOSITION OF BORDEAUX TO THE UNITED STATES.

From the end of April until November, 1907, Bordeaux, the important and well-known French port, will hold an International Exposition in commemoration of the one-hundredth anniversary of the application of steam to navigation. It was in 1807 that Robert Fulton launched on the Hudson River the first steamboat, the "Clermont," which made regular passages between New York and Albany. The trial was successful; it excited great admiration, and steamboats were rapidly multiplied, not only on the American rivers, but also on all the navigable waters of the civilized world.

To the first centenary of such a great event — the most important and interesting in the history of navigation—such a powerful naval and maritime nation as France could not be indifferent; furthermore, it must be remembered that it was in France, on the river Loire, that Fulton, in 1803, made his initial experiment. He remained in France quite a long time, living in Paris for nearly seven years, in the home of the American poet, Mr. Joel Barlow, at that time Minister to France. There, besides studying physics, chemistry and mathematics, he learned the French language, which he spoke fluently when he returned to America.

The French have decided to celebrate the centennial anniversary of the successful application of steam to navigation by illustrating the history of navigation from the earliest times. Models of every kind of ship, ancient and modern, commercial and naval, are to be collected, together with a display of all that pertains to ocean geography and to river and sea navigation. This will be complemented by an International Exposition of all kinds of raw

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

and manufactured goods, as the extension of trade has been the consequence of Fulton's invention.

The International Maritime Exposition, while organized by the competent "*Ligue Maritime Française,*" which has for President Admiral Gervais of the French Navy, is under the official patronage of the French Government, the General Council of the Gironde, the Municipality, the Chamber of Commerce and the Philomathic Society of Bordeaux. The Commissioner-General for this important world's fair, which will be more interesting than any other of that kind ever held, is M. Bertin, ex-Engineer-in-Chief of the French Navy, Member of the "*Institut de France.*" He has for Deputy Commissioner-General M. V. Morlot, the distinguished Parisian publicist.

They have decided, for the Exposition, a general classification of subjects into seventeen groups, as follows:

"Marine History and Fine Arts; Instruction; Charts and Instruments; Navigation and Commerce; Navy; Materials for Construction; Motor Machines and Propellers; Fittings and Apparatus; Automobile Navigation and Boats of all types; Aeronautics; Port and Harbor Works; Sea and River Fishing; Hygiene, Salvage and Sports; Ship's Provisions, Food; Various Industries; Commercial Relations of Bordeaux with the Colonies; Social Economy, Works of Mutuality and Charity."

Each group is divided into classes, which sometimes number as many as eleven.

The Exposition of Bordeaux being in honor of an American inventor, all exhibits coming from the United States will go into the main building, a splendid construction, 750 feet long and 400 feet wide, built on the model of the Palace of the Doges at Venice. It will be a reproduction of the most elegant kind, a piece of art of exquisite beauty.

Numerous international congresses will reunite the experts on maritime, commercial and scientific questions, and important and profitable discussions will take place.

A Special Committee of Honor, composed of forty-six prominent Americans, is patronizing the United States Section.

The General Committee of Honor of the Exposition has for President M. Armand Fallières, President of the French Republic; after him come Messrs. Casimir Périer and Emile Loubet, formerly, also, Presidents of the French Republic; then, the most famous French names in politics, industry, trade, finance and science.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The English, Germans, Japanese, Russians, Italians, Dutch and Spaniards are represented also in the General Committee of Honor by the most prominent men of their countries.

Official notification and invitations have been despatched to all the nations, most of which have already agreed to participate, as Fulton's genius has been profitable to every country, no matter where it is located, no matter what its degree of civilization or the density of its population.

The principal naval nations, including the United States, have decided to send imposing squadrons either for the inauguration of the Exposition or during the continuance of the Fair. Furthermore, the leading countries of the world, participating officially, will each erect, or are already erecting, a national pavilion on a site placed freely at their disposal. The effect of these pavilions, scattered throughout the magnificent gardens of the Exposition, will be extremely pleasing—here, an old English mansion full of simplicity and charm, with upholstery and furniture of some other century, or a Russian building, with lengthened and high-pointed domes; there, a reduction of a massive and solid German castle, with gray stones, Gothic-carved windows and an "open door," or an elegant Japanese pagoda, with superposed roofs, complicated carpentry work and, as decorations, strange animals in metal and wonderful flowers; farther on, a coquettish Italian construction of the purest Renaissance style, or a Flemish belfry, with a delightful chime of bells playing at all hours; elsewhere, a Swiss cottage with flowery belvedere, or Dutch, Austrian, Spanish and Mexican buildings reproducing faithfully the respective national characters. Each construction will stand on a site carefully selected for it, and will be surrounded by landscapes the most appropriate for the nicest artistic effect.

President Roosevelt has sent a special message to the Senate recommending an appropriation to permit the United States to be represented in that cordial and fraternal meeting of the nations.

The message accompanies a report from the acting Secretary of State suggesting that the appropriation should be granted quickly.

Under such influential and favorable auspices, no doubt, the United States, also, will have their own pavilion at Bordeaux; it will contain, mainly, Robert Fulton's relics, kindly promised by his descendants living in this country, American flags, busts, and

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

pictures of United States Presidents, paintings recalling historical episodes in which this country and France were connected, some governmental exhibits, etc.

As a citizen, Robert Fulton was a very good one; he ardently loved his country. In 1796, he published in London a treatise upon canals, and secured a patent for a double inclined plane to be used for purposes of transportation. All this, with models of machines, was submitted to Sir John Sinclair, President of the British Board of Agriculture, and was received with complimentary resolutions of recommendation. Remembering his own country, Robert Fulton sent to the Governor of Pennsylvania and to General George Washington copies of this treatise and full explanations. The acknowledgment to Fulton was expressed in the most thankful manner. Patriotism as well as gratitude to the promoters of progress are the great civic virtues of the American people, and, owing to this precious fact, we may confidently hope that the distinguished statesmen who have to decide upon the official participation of the United States in the International Exposition of Bordeaux will say that Fulton's own country shall take part in celebrating his achievement.

The application of steam to navigation—the most pacific, useful and beneficent invention — has extensively developed trade, disseminating wealth and prosperity; it has made practicable bold expeditions, such as those led by Peary in his search for the Arctic Pole; it has aided important scientific observations and discoveries; it has brought together the people of very dissimilar countries, facilitating the study of languages, industries and fine arts.

The Robert Fulton Monument Association of New York, which has Mr. Cornelius Vanderbilt for President, will this year lay the cornerstone of a splendid mausoleum in memory of the great inventor; while, in France, at Bordeaux, there will be not only this International Exposition, but also the erection, in Paris, of an allegorical monument as a tribute of respect and esteem to Robert Fulton, and to his precursors, Denis Papin and Jouffroy d'Abbans, who also made studies and experiments on the same subject, though it was only after Fulton's triumph that the invention became effective.

HENRY BAYER.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

NEW BOOKS REVIEWED.

BY HENRY JAMES FORMAN, ARTHUR BARTLETT MAURICE AND SIMEON E. BALDWIN.

LORD ACTON'S "LECTURES ON MODERN HISTORY."*

THE profound student of history will beyond all doubt find a vast deal of absolutely authoritative and reliable information in these sixteen lectures of Lord Acton collected by careful editors in the present volume. No historian of recent years possessed a more thorough knowledge of facts, no one had a clearer mind for associating and grouping them, and no one a deeper reverence for them. But to that great majority made up of what is called the "lay reader" the book is of greater importance even than to the student of history generally. It is, in fact, a primer of history.

The word "primer" may suggest a sort of elementary text for the young, but that it is emphatically not. He who would venture into these lectures must be resolved for serious work. Their very style has a forbidding air. Indeed, Lord Acton's conviction that history must be approached with gravity and sobriety brings to his work a regrettable kind of cloistral austerity. "His lectures," the editors tell us in the introduction, "were not either in delivery or substance adapted to the assiduous note-taker." Obviously they were not. The reader may recall Stevenson's opinion upon the style of Lord Acton's predecessor at Cambridge, Sir John Seeley, whose manner of writing Stevenson termed "a winking, curled-and-oiled, ultra-cultured, Oxford-don sort of an affectation that infuriates my honest soul." And Seeley's style, be it said, was perhaps ten times simpler and better than the best of

* "Lectures on Modern History." By the late Rt. Hon. John Edward Emerich, Lord Acton. New York and London: The Macmillan Co.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Lord Acton's. The virtue of the present volume, clearly, lies in the substance, and the gist and heart of it is a kind of pious zeal and fervor for historical knowledge.

Those who follow French literature may remember how a recent life of St. Francis of Assisi, by the perfervid religious enthusiasm in its pages, wrought so potently on certain French minds that even some students of the Latin Quarter, it is said, embraced the cult of St. Francis. For a brief space they walked in his footsteps and added chastity and charity to the virtue of poverty, already theirs. The lectures of Lord Acton will, in similar fashion, though perhaps more abidingly, instil in the reader a great desire for historical study. On his very first page, the author cites that famous dictum of Seeley's that, "Politics are vulgar when they are not liberalized by history, and history fades into mere literature when it loses sight of its relation to practical politics." With him we stand aghast at the darkness of the Middle Ages when men "became content to be deceived, to live in a twilight of fiction, under clouds of false witnesses," and with him we rejoice that "unlike the dreaming historic world ours . . . has devoted its best energy and treasure to the sovereign purpose of detecting error and vindicating entrusted truth." No intellectual exercise, he tells us, "can be more invigorating than to watch the working of the mind of Napoleon, the most entirely known as well as the ablest of historic men." And every part of modern history, he assures us, "is weighty with inestimable lessons that we must learn by experience and at a great price, if we know not how to profit by the example and teaching of those who have gone before us, in a society largely resembling the one we live in."

The sixteen lectures, naturally, do not pretend to cover the whole domain of Modern History. If the work of Lord Acton could without a feeling of irreverence be compared to anything journalistic, it might be said that these lectures are like the captions of a newspaper. Run your eye over them and you gain an idea, though not a very complete one, of the day's news. In the same manner a perusal of these chapters will give the reader a kind of bulletin of the history that was made between the dates of the Renaissance and the American Revolution. The lectures are crowded with facts. Take, for instance, the one on "The New World." Beginning with the explorations of Henry

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the Navigator, the lecture touches, however briefly, upon every important point of exploration and discovery down to the voyages of Cortez. Even more complex and comprehensive is the subject of the "Renaissance." It was the age of the revival of Greek learning and humanism, and also the age of endless bloodshed and cruelty. Every one penned sentimental poems after Petrarch, while, at the same time, Machiavelli wrote his famous treatise. Savonarola thundered against vice and vanity, while Pope Alexander VI and his children practised every crime to such an extent that even to-day the name of Borgia is synonymous with monster. And yet, for all its complexity, Lord Acton treats of the subject in one lecture in such a way that no important group of facts is left untouched. And the net result of reading this portion is an awakened desire in the student to penetrate further into that brightly colored, vivid period. Some of the other topics dealt with in similar fashion are "Luther," "The Thirty Years' War," "The English Revolution," "Lewis XIV," "Peter the Great" and "The American Revolution." Every sentence carries with it the conviction of truth, and every page creates an impulse to delve deeper into the subject-matter. And before long we become at one with the author in his idea that the study of history "fulfils its purpose even if it only makes us wiser, without producing books, and gives us the gift of historical thinking, which is better than historical learning."

HENRY JAMES FORMAN.

A NEW HUMORIST.

IF contemporary fiction is to be judged and classified according to the standards which have prevailed for the past eight or ten years, Mr. Nesbit must be credited with having, in "The Gentleman Ragman,"* tapped what is practically a new vein of humor, for to find the plausible suggestion for its spirit and atmosphere one must turn back to the rollicking, whimsical and yet always half-serious pages of "Tom Sawyer" and "Huckleberry Finn." This is a bold comparison, and one which, even with the necessary modification, constitutes bold praise. Yet it is an inevitable

* "The Gentleman Ragman." By Wilbur Nesbit. New York: Harper & Brothers.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

comparison, and the praise is far from being entirely undeserved. For while "The Gentleman Ragman" has in detail many minor faults, and as a whole is singularly uneven, in strict fairness all this must be subordinated to the frank recognition of a genuine achievement. Mr. Nesbit has succeeded in creating an environment. The Gentleman Ragman is one Asbury Dabney Colquhoun, otherwise known as the Emigger—a local corruption of the old French *émigré*—a Virginian gentleman of lineage and mettle, who, having left his native State to avoid, on account of reasons which are to his lasting credit and which in no way reflect upon his personal courage, an hereditary feud, settles down in Plainville in the humble capacity from which the story takes its name, and speedily turns his Quixotic impulses to practical account. The Emigger, when he first drifts into the office of the "Chronicle," that redoubtable moulder of public opinion conducted by the eminent Eli James Bashford, "late of Cincinnati, Ohio," seems a rather formidable figure of a man, tall and dark-eyed, and with a long black drooping mustache that in the mind of Johnnie Thompson, the youthful narrator of the tale, conjures up visions of Simon Legree in the "Uncle Tom's Cabin" pictures. But his voice is not that of Legree, and instead of the anticipated truculent outburst his first remark is a genial interrogation as to whether his young interlocutor is "any connection of the Thompsons of Virginia," which amiable method of breaking down the barriers of formality he is wont to use with every person with whom he comes in contact. Lowly and unromantic as is the occupation by which the Emigger introduces himself to Plainville, his force of character and his quaint chivalry make him from the beginning a decided factor in the life of the little community, sharing its furtive tragedies, and participating, with a quaint, unconscious gravity in its droll pastimes and social diversions.

The originality of "The Gentleman Ragman" lies almost wholly in its characterizations and descriptions. The main thread of the narrative is one of the oldest in fiction, although here it is handled with a genuine freshness and vigor. There is the expected Tempter who enters the tale in the person of Arthur Keene Branthorpe, "Stage Director and Impresario," who visits Plainville for the purpose of getting up theatrical productions by home talent of his own play, "The Last Shot," for the benefit of the Sons of Veterans, and persuades Annie Davis, the stage-struck

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

heroine of the story, to leave her home for the purpose of meeting him in a near-by city, where he will be able, he promises, to embark her upon a great dramatic career. Luckily part of his plans go astray, and Annie Davis, after an unpleasant but not irrevocable experience, through the agency of the Emigger and Oscar Ferguson, Plainville's juvenile Sherlock Holmes, is brought back to her family and friends. Branthorpe later appears with a travelling theatrical troupe, but after an encounter with the Emigger that is marked with plenty of vigor and spirit, finds his courage ooze at the crucial moment, and makes a hurried escape by means of a strange horse and buggy. Add to this comparatively time-worn complication some exciting episodes pertaining to the invasion of the Emigger's adopted town by his feudal enemy Pinkney Sanger, the resulting pistol battle in which Sanger comes out second best, the Emigger's love-affair with Annie Davis, and one or two other love-affairs, and you have briefly all that there is to "The Gentleman Ragman" as a story pure and simple.

But if the action be slight, there is never the impression of its being strung out or thin, for with the background of Plainville, and the acquaintance of Eli James Bashford, and Oscar Ferguson, and Ike Peters, and Ira Growley, and Mrs. Flora Beavers, the action becomes of very secondary importance. The editor of the country newspaper is by no means a new type in fiction, but one must look far to find a more delightful specimen of the tribe than Mr. Bashford, whose only explanation of his reason for coming to Plainville was that some one had told him that there was a fine opening for a young man, and that while he was looking for the opening somebody had pushed him in. Then there is Ike Peters, called by Mr. Bashford the "before-taking exhibit of Plainville," an incorrigible reader of medicine advertisements and almanacs, forever boasting of his symptoms, always buying the first bottle offered by the travelling patent-medicine salesman, no matter what it is meant to cure. Had he not had false teeth "he would let the travelling dentists pull them for nothing to exhibit their painless system." Nor is it possible to overlook the bouncing Mrs. Flora Beavers, who finds her affinity in the amorous Bashford, whose mania for collecting premiums has led her to the acquisition of the most extraordinary accumulation of odds and ends — swings and centre-tables, photograph-albums, panels of kittens over the mantels, yards of puppies, imitation

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

oil-paintings of Washington Crossing the Delaware, parlor suits, bookcases and sets of Dickens and Shakespeare. And a youth who would have proved a comrade dear to the heart of Tom Sawyer is Oscar Ferguson, with his revolvers, his handcuffs and his nickel-plated detective star, a follower of clues, a delver into ciphers, a jotter-down of mysterious notes that strangely enough serve a purpose, who meets Bashford's attempts at sprightly badinage with the portentous retort, "We cannot divulge matters to the press at this stage of the investigation." For this generous gathering of interesting people, for the quaint humor and the ring of homely sincerity, "The Gentleman Ragman," as a book by itself, will demand of the discriminating reader much more than mere passing attention. But, above all, the discriminating reader will lay it aside with the conviction that good as the book is as a story, it is far more distinctive as a promise than as an actual achievement. And by him, Mr. Nesbit will not be lightly forgotten, but will be remembered as one who should go far.

ARTHUR BARTLETT MAURICE.

"THE FEDERAL POWER OVER CARRIERS AND CORPORATIONS."*

THIS is the book of a lawyer, but one written less for lawyers than for those, whatever may be their lines of life, who are now studying from the historical standpoint the Rooseveltian theory of constitutional government.

The point of departure in all discussion of the particular subject of the volume is the opinion of Chief-Justice Marshall, delivered in 1824, in the case of the Fulton steamboats, known as Gibbons *vs.* Ogden. It is there that, after observing that the Constitution of the United States contains an enumeration rather than a definition of powers, and that "an enumeration presupposes something not enumerated," he declares that, as no power over the completely internal commerce of a State was among those enumerated in the grant to Congress, none was entrusted to it. But what is that "completely internal commerce"? It is, he continues, the commerce "carried on between man and man in a State, or between different parts of the same State, and which

* "The Federal Power over Carriers and Corporations." By E. Parmalee Prentice. New York: The Macmillan Co.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

does not extend to or affect other States." But where is the power to regulate what precedes commerce between States? Can there be a refusal to allow goods to become the subject of that commerce by the State until it has given its approval of their quality, or by Congress until the United States have given their approval of the manner in which, or the agency by which, they were produced?

Marshall answers the first of these questions in the affirmative. State inspection laws, he declares, are expressly recognized in the Constitution, but not as an incident to any State power over interstate or foreign commerce:

> "They act upon the subject before it becomes an article of foreign commerce, or of commerce among the States, and prepare it for that purpose. They form a portion of that immense mass of legislation which embraces everything within the territory of a State, not surrendered to the general government. . . . No direct general power over these subjects is granted to Congress; and, consequently, they remain subject to State legislation. If the legislative power of the Union can reach them, it must be for national purposes; it must be where the power is expressly given for a special purpose, or is clearly incidental to some power which is expressly given."

Mr. Prentice devotes a chapter (chap. III) to Gibbons *vs.* Ogden, but its main purpose is to narrow its doctrine to the case in hand. Thus read, it amounts, he argues, to nothing more than a decision that a State monopoly of a particular mode of navigation between States, being a regulation of the coasting trade, cannot avail as against a coasting license issued by authority of the United States. It is true that this was the point on which the case turned, but to reach it certain lines of reasoning were necessary, and to the steps in these, as above outlined, the author seems to have hardly paid the attention which they deserve. They are by no means *obiter dicta*. It would have been an *obiter dictum* had the court done what in one or two places he says it did (pp. 68, 74), namely, decided that the power of Congress over interstate commerce was in its nature exclusive. While Mr. Justice Johnson took this ground, it was simply observed in the opinion of the court that the argument in favor of that position was of great force, and they were not satisfied that it had been refuted. On the other hand, it was vital to the precise point in issue to proceed to it by a determination of what

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

commerce between States was, and how it differed from the commerce within a State.

It is the second branch of the second of the questions stated to which the work of Mr. Prentice is particularly addressed. His position is that Congress cannot limit the subjects of interstate commerce by excluding such as are produced by agencies which the United States may not approve, and so cannot insist on Federal charters or licenses for corporations desiring to engage in trade of that description. There is, he asserts (p. 4), "no doubt that the plan is entirely beyond the scope of the Constitution." This treats perhaps too cavalierly a project of legislation, proposed in form by the executive department, but it is spoken with the earnestness of conviction, and a considerable array of historical facts is produced in its support. He proves beyond question (pp. 17, 22) that the prime motive of giving to Congress its powers over commerce was to regulate navigation, but this hardly goes as far as he claims towards constituting a test for interpreting the words of the grant (pp. 147, 223). A more important circumstance is effectively stated and pressed (pp. 30-37), that the right to engage in commerce is "part of the liberty derived from the States," and so not the proper subject of a governmental license.

The position taken in late years by the Supreme Court (contrary to the views of Marshall, Story and Taney, and to the repeated use of the terms in the general Customs Act of 1799), that the "imports" and "exports" referred to in the Constitution do not include the transportation of goods between States, is vigorously challenged (pp. 39-47, 136).

A valuable feature of the book is its full statements as to State grants of monopolies of land carriage (pp. 62, 93), which were only suppressed as to interstate railroads by Act of Congress in 1866.

The plan of forcing interstate carriers to incorporate under a Federal law, Mr. Prentice thinks radically unsound, because the United States can only create corporations for the better fulfilment of some Federal administrative function (pp. 146, 149, 155). To make them, while incorporated by a State, subject to inspection or visitation, as corporations, in any matter not directly connected with interstate or foreign carriage, would, he argues, be equally unjustifiable; and here he is able to quote passages (p.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

170) from decisions of the Supreme Court which strongly support his contention that the power of Congress is "limited to such regulations as will prevent burdens upon the act of communication." That this is an arbitrary limit has, he thinks, been often ignored by courts, but though logically undiscoverable from the premises of the Constitution, he believes it to be a logical consequence of the principles which the Constitution built upon those premises (p. 171). President Roosevelt tells Congress that "it is difficult to be patient" with an argument that the regulation of corporations formed for interstate transportation should be left to the States, but Mr. Prentice insists that this is mere impatience with the Constitution of the United States, which was not designed to transfer the oversight of corporations, whatever be their business, from the government which created them to a government that did not and could not create them (p. 175). Rather, in his view, as in that of Judge Evans, who has held the recent Federal Employers' Liability Act, for this reason, to be void, the power of Congress over commerce, taken by itself, is too narrow to support even the existing legislation. That must be rested on its duty to preserve interstate commerce from unconstitutional impediments and keep it free (p. 225).

The work contains the results of a careful study by a thoughtful man of the conditions out of which the provisions of the Constitution of the United States respecting commerce arose, and of their whole judicial history. It was evidently inspired by a profound conviction that the tendencies of the past few years, countenanced in high quarters, towards centralization of power at Washington, gravely menace the liberty of the individual and the security of the government to which he must always look, in most things, for the protection of his natural rights. It is the same conviction which Justice Brewer forcibly expressed in his address in 1906, before the Virginia State Bar Association on "Two Periods in the History of the Supreme Court"—that of national stability, and that of national enlargement.

Both in that address and in the volume under review it is conceded that the changes of a century in commercial and social conditions may call for changes in law. "Population," observes Mr. Prentice (p. 212), "has become dependent upon remote sources of supply. Each State is no longer sufficient for itself." But the remedy suggested is to amend the Constitution; not for

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

courts or Presidents or Congresses to twist and distort it into something else. The same thought appears in Justice Brewer's address. "Never," said he, "let the courts attempt to change laws or Constitution to meet what they think present conditions require. When they do this, they clearly usurp power belonging to the legislature and the people."

SIMEON E. BALDWIN.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

WORLD-POLITICS.

BERLIN: WASHINGTON.

BERLIN, *January, 1907.*

THE electoral campaign, of which the result will be proclaimed from the polling-booths a few days after the publication of these pages, marks the beginning of a new era in the political history of the German Empire. It is the opening phase of a long-delayed struggle between the supporters of the personal régime and those of representative government. That struggle has been rendered inevitable by the character of the present Emperor. When, some weeks before the dissolution of the Reichstag, Prince von Bülow challenged the deputies to quote a single instance in which the Emperor had violated the Constitution, he was answered with a burst of mocking laughter. Yet it was impossible to refute the contention. The Emperor has, indeed, kept within the letter of the Imperial Constitution. But he has transgressed its spirit. Had he not done so, there would have been little disposition to cavil at Prince von Bülow's affirmation that the office and functions of the Chancellor furnished the most absolute guarantees against any violation of the Constitution by the monarch. It is, however, precisely in his relations to the successive Chancellors of the Empire that the Emperor William II has acted in flagrant opposition not to the letter, but to the spirit of the Constitution. For he has reduced the office of Chancellor to insignificance. And however much Prince von Bülow may boast that he has brought the actions of the Emperor into conformity with the law, by means of his "authentic interpretations" of them, the fact remains that as Chancellor he is merely the diplomatic secretary of his master, who too frequently disdains to avail himself of his services. It is true that the Prince, in a passage that requires much reading between the lines, hinted to the Reichstag that

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

there was a limit to his subservience to the autocratic eccentricities of the Emperor; but, even if that problematical limit were far less remote than appears to be the case, the argument would lose none of its force that a Chancellor, dependent for his office upon the royal will, constitutes but a frail safeguard against any breaches of the Constitution by the monarch. So far, the history of the German Empire has not produced a single Chancellor who has demonstrated his independence of mind by resigning of his own accord. Bismarck and every one of his successors have clung to office until they were virtually dismissed. They have chosen to consider themselves the servants, not of the people, but of the Emperor, and have in too many instances prostituted their exalted office to his caprices. Not without justice, therefore, did a great Liberal organ reply to Prince von Bülow's speech with the trenchant observation that the office of Chancellor could never be regarded as a bulwark of the liberties of the people until Chancellors should have learned how and when to resign.

Two decades ago, few people, outside the ranks of the Social Democrats and the extreme Radicals, would have disputed the contention of the Chancellor that Germans expect their monarch to be a man of powerful volition and initiative, and not a mere constitutional puppet. Now, however, it is generally admitted that the present Emperor has cured the nation of its taste for "individuality" in its sovereigns. For William II has obtruded his individuality into every department of the national life with a persistency which, it is felt, has become intolerable. In questions of art, religion, science, sport and politics he has paraded his views and exploited his prerogatives, with a pompous display of superficial knowledge which has alienated the sympathies, and set on edge the nerves of almost the entire people. At first the hypnotized belief of the public in his abilities, and in his apparently phenomenal powers of work, rescued him from general criticism. But, in recent years, and more especially in recent months, faith both in his capacities and in his industry has been converted into frank scepticism. It is in vain that the Emperor inveighs against the spirit of pessimism that is abroad in the land. In rank mutiny, his mentors admit the correctness of his affirmation that the material prospects of the Empire were never brighter than they are to-day, and that any other country, blessed with similar prospects, would be inspired by feelings of the ut-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

most elation. Most true, say the critics; but, unfortunately, this brilliant economical outlook does not justify Germans in anticipating their future with confidence, because that future is jeopardized by the individuality and the impetuous blunders of their present monarch. William II, in fact, is himself the cause, so his mentors inform him, of the pessimism which to-day afflicts, as with a fell disease, the educated classes of the Empire.

So wide-spread is the discontent with the monarch that His Majesty has felt it incumbent on himself to speak in his own defence. He has been especially piqued by the observation, attributed by the late Prince Hohenlohe in his historical memoirs to the Empress Frederick, that her son wasted far too much of his time and money in satisfying his passion for traveling. To this palpable hit the monarch has replied in the form of a published conversation with Dr. Ganghofer, the Bavarian poet, and in that dialogue he describes himself as an inveterate worker, who seeks relief from the almost intolerable burden of his exalted duties by frequent indulgence in changes of scene. In this way, so the Emperor remarks, it becomes possible for him to obtain, at one and the same time, recreation and first-hand information regarding the different quarters of the Empire. His only regret, according to his own version, is that his journeyings cannot be conducted without pomp and circumstance. The Emperor's defence has not been favorably, or even respectfully, received by the public. One Radical journal, after recounting the vast sums squandered by various corporations in entertaining him, suggests that he might, if he wished, obtain a more accurate view of the condition of his subjects by travelling *incognito,* as do other princes and monarchs. As to the Emperor's devotion to the gospel of work, that, as Kipling would say, is another tale. It is a tale, unfortunately, in which the nation refuses any longer to believe. It used to be credited, but the popular mind is now filled with insidious rumors, which no amount of protestation by His Majesty can dissipate, that His Majesty is more addicted to pleasure than to duty, and that it is with the utmost difficulty that Prince von Bülow and the Secretaries of State can ever induce him to attend to public business. Why, the public with many mysterious nods inquires, does Herr von Lucanus defy the growing infirmities of his old age in order to retain his position as Chief of the Imperial Cabinet? The answer is that he does

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

so from patriotic motives which are appreciated by none more than by the Chancellor; that Herr von Lucanus, knowing the psychology of His Majesty better than any other living man, is able to watch for the rare moments in which the Kaiser can be induced to attend to the business of state. Those moments he deftly exploits by suddenly placing before the monarch's eye some document or bill requiring immediate attention, and so unerring is his judgment in this particular that the veteran courtier seldom fails in his object and in satisfying the requirements of the statesmen of Germany.

Many of these characteristic stories of Berlin Court life, which have long circulated among the initiated, are the subject of guarded references in a remarkable book, published just before the dissolution of the Reichstag, under the title "Our Emperor and his People: German Anxieties." The writer, who undoubtedly is a man of position having access to the intimacies of Court and official life, has made a profound study of the character of the Emperor, and he acquaints the nation with some very significant conclusions to be drawn from his observations. He delineates the monarch as a man who is haunted by the ambition to appear omniscient, and to impress his personality upon all with whom he comes into personal contact. This ambition, which is inflated by an overweening sense of his "divine rights," leads the Emperor deliberately to discard the cloak of ministerial authority and to assume personal responsibility before the world for the policy of the Empire in all its ramifications. But while it stimulates him to interfere perpetually with the course of public business, it is impotent to overcome his dislike, and even hatred, of the dry details of administration. The consequence is that, despite his extraordinary powers of rapidly assimilating information, the Emperor is rarely if ever correctly informed upon any question. He unconsciously imbibes the prejudices and predilections of his courtiers, and rejects the systematized knowledge of his statesmen. Rarely, says our author, are the official advisers of the Emperor able to communicate their views to him, for he invariably cuts short their expositions in order that he may lecture them at length on their own specialty. The Emperor, in fact, is an eloquent talker, but a most indifferent listener; and his sense of omniscience fans his passion for suddenly soaring away from the region of details into the empyrean of delectable

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

generalities. To this passion Prince von Bülow makes constant concessions. He has reduced to a fine art the task of preparing witty summaries of fact, which it is essential the monarch should know, and of adorning those facts with appropriate literary and philosophical allusions. In this way he has established a greater ascendency than any of his predecessors over the affections and mind of the Emperor. But, dexterously as he handles the monarch, even Prince von Bülow is never secure from disagreeable surprises in the shape of occasional Imperial actions undertaken at the inspiration of a sudden impulse, or as the result of suggestions skilfully thrown out by members of the Court Cabal, to serve special ends and with the object of humiliating the Chancellor and flattering the Emperor by exhibiting him as his own Chancellor and as the head and fount of German policy.

In every department of the national life the Emperor sporadically intervenes with capricious displays of his power. He sends messages to school-teachers commanding them to grant a holiday to their scholars; despatches a regiment of cavalry to a previously ungarrisoned town in order that a promise made to a deputation of young ladies may be fulfilled; denounces leading dignitaries of the Lutheran Church or distinguished artists whose politics, theology or pictures fail to conform to his taste; and generally comports himself in a way that renders explicable the unique success which attended the exploits carried out in the Imperial name by the "Captain of Koepenick." His love of display, as the author of "German Anxieties" points out, has banished from the army and the Bureaucracy the traditional Spartan spirit. Officials are now no longer content to work for the satisfaction of their own immediate superiors; they have their eyes constantly fixed upon the Emperor, and indulge in every manner of intrigue in the hope of attracting to their persons the notice of the monarch.

The Colonial Department has been affected to a notorious degree by this spirit of Byzantinism. A peculiar significance consequently attaches to the fact that the Reichstag has joined issue with the Imperial Government on a colonial question. For the German Protectorates, more than any other province of the administration, are the children of Imperial Autocracy. They are governed by Imperial decree; by Imperial decree their laws and by-laws are promulgated, and their Governors are appointed by

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

virtue of the Imperial prerogative. The Reichstag, in fact, has no other function than the modest one of voting ever-increasing funds for their up-keep. Should the Government be defeated, what will it do? Will it flout the decision of the electorate by dissolving the Reichstag a second time? There are many influential personages in the vicinity of the Emperor who would like nothing better than to see him execute a *coup d'état* by abolishing the system of universal manhood suffrage which obtains in all elections to the Imperial Diet. That, however, would be an extremely dangerous experiment, and one that the Emperor has declined to sanction in previous electoral crises. Those who know His Majesty best predict that he will give vent to his anger rather in words than in deeds, and that the new Reichstag, when it assembles, will find itself confronted with a situation in regard to Southwest Africa ideally suited to a compromise. In other words, the Hottentot war will be declared at an end, a large portion of the troops will be recalled, and the deputies will be able with a clear conscience to vote the supplies necessary to bring them home. They will in this way have won a victory, which the Government may deny, for the authority of Parliament. And the fight thus begun may be continued, through many compromises, to an ultimate issue in favor of representative institutions.

WASHINGTON, *January, 1907.*

SINCE the reassembling of Congress for the post-holiday session, the principal topic of discussion in the Federal capital has been the Brownsville affair, of which the latest phase is the President's avowal in a special message that, when in his order disbanding three companies of colored soldiers he undertook to debar them from subsequent employment in the civil service, he exceeded the limits of his constitutional authority. So far as the rest of the order is concerned, Mr. Roosevelt reiterates his belief that he did not transcend the powers vested in him by the Federal organic law. Not a few judges and eminent lawyers, however, concur with Senator Foraker in thinking that the President has no constitutional right to discharge "without honor" a soldier who has not been tried and convicted of an offence specified in the military code. It is by no means impossible that the Senate may ultimately express such an opinion in the form of a resolution. Mr. Roosevelt has said, however, that, even if a joint resolution de-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

nouncing his order of dismissal as unconstitutional should be passed by both Houses, he would refuse to sign it, and, in the improbable event of its being passed over his veto by a two-thirds rule, he would decline to obey it, until the United States Supreme Court should have approved the judgment of Congress. This is the first time in American history that an American President has made such a declaration, much less lived up to it. During the Reconstruction period, bill after bill was vetoed by Andrew Johnson; but, after a bill had been passed over his veto, and had thus become a law, he did not challenge its authority, or venture to suspend the execution of it until it should have been sanctioned by the highest Federal tribunal. There is no doubt that a bill passed by a two-thirds vote over a veto *is* from that moment a law, and remains so until it has been set aside as unconstitutional by the United States Supreme Court. During the interval, the President is bound by his oath to obey it. Yet Mr. Roosevelt asserts that, by virtue of his executive authority, he would suspend it. There is no warrant in the Constitution for the assertion of such authority, and we cannot believe that such expert lawyers as Secretary Root and Secretary Taft would uphold the threatened usurpation.

Andrew Jackson is, so far, the only President who has left the Presidential office more influential and popular than when he entered it. That Mr. Roosevelt's career would resemble Jackson's in this respect seemed probable six months ago, but no one who listens to the private conversation of public men in Washington would now pronounce it probable. The discussion provoked by the President's treatment of the Brownsville incident has caused observers to recall and review other acts of his which have evinced an arbitrary spirit and a lax conception of executive authority. Where, it is asked, did Mr. Roosevelt find a constitutional warrant for his appointment of the Anthracite Coal-Strike Commission? It is true that Congress practically acknowledged the constitutionality of that proceeding by appropriating a sum of money for the payment of the Commissioners. Could an appropriation for a similar purpose be secured to-day? Another question which is often put is, Did not the President violate the sixth clause of the first section of the second Article of the Constitution when he departed on a voyage to the Isthmus of Panama, without recognizing his inability to discharge during his absence

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

from the country the powers and duties of his office, and without calling upon the Vice-President to assume his office *ad interim?* Another inquiry which one hears in private conversation, though it has not yet been made in either Chamber of the Federal Legislature, is, Can Mr. Roosevelt's acceptance of the Nobel prize, which was awarded to him by the Norwegian Storthing, be reconciled with the eighth clause of the ninth section of the first Article of the Constitution, the clause declaring that "no person holding any office of profit or trust under the United States shall, without the consent of the Congress, accept of any present, emolument, office or title of any kind whatever, from any king, prince or foreign state." Another query is propounded: Where did Mr. Roosevelt find constitutional warrant for his threat to use the military force of the United States to secure for Japanese pupils admission to any of the San Francisco public schools that they might desire to attend? If there is any power not delegated to the United States by the Constitution nor prohibited by it to the States, but reserved to the States respectively, or to the people considered as a whole, it certainly is the power to regulate public education. The President and his friends contend, we understand, that the segregation of Japanese pupils in San Francisco under a California law is a violation of the treaty between Japan and the United States, whereby we assured to the Mikado's subjects all the privileges conceded to the "most favored nation." That treaty, they say, is made the supreme law of the land, by the second section of the sixth Article of the Constitution, and the judges in every State are bound thereby, anything in the Constitution or laws of any State to the contrary notwithstanding. But what are the specific words of the Constitution? They are that "All treaties made or which shall be made, *under the authority of the United States,* shall be the supreme law of the land." Where are the limitations of "the authority of the United States" defined? In our Federal Constitution itself, and especially in the Tenth Amendment. There are many who think that our Federal Executive has no right so to frame or interpret a treaty as to infringe upon powers reserved to the several States.

When the various assumptions of authority to which we have here referred are brought together and surveyed collectively, they are seen to compose a record which even those most ready to recognize the fine traits which Mr. Roosevelt possesses can hardly

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

help regarding with some misgiving and dismay. On the whole, the truest and wisest friends of the present Chief Magistrate must, in their hearts, acknowledge that it may prove just as well for the country, and for Mr. Roosevelt himself, that, owing to his own exemplary act of abnegation, it is settled that his term of office will come to an end on March 4th, 1909.

Another subject which has been discussed with a good deal of interest during and since the holidays is the question mooted in the December number of this REVIEW, the question whether, in the event of a war between Japan and the United States, England would side with the former Power. Would the Anglo-Japanese Treaty of Alliance require the British Government to pursue such a course? Arguments *pro* and *con* have been advanced. On the one hand, it is pointed out that the preamble seems to narrow the operation of the treaty to the maintenance of the rights of the signatories *in Asia,* but this objection is met by recalling the rule followed in the interpretation of treaties, the rule, namely, that, where a preamble seems inconsistent with, or narrower than, the declaratory articles which follow, the latter must control the construers of the document. Now, the second article of the Anglo-Japanese Treaty provides that, "Should either of the high contracting parties be involved in war in defence of its territorial rights, *or special interests,* the other party shall at once come to the assistance of its ally." It will scarcely be asserted that the upholding of the treaty rights of her citizens would not be looked upon by Japan as one of her "special interests." There could be no doubt about the matter, if the violation of the treaty rights whereof Japan complained had been committed, not in San Francisco, but in Manila. Some of those who have written on the subject say that the British people would never permit its Government to take part in a contest waged by an alien race against their kinsmen beyond sea. The London "Standard," however, denies that under any circumstances would the British nation repudiate a treaty, no matter how repugnant might be the obligations imposed, or how possibly disastrous to Britain herself might be a faithful compliance with them. The general disposition of Englishmen is to dismiss the question as academic, and to declare that the supposed contingency of a war between Japan and the United States will never occur.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

THE EDITOR'S DIARY.

WEDNESDAY, *January 23.* Is God Omnipotent?

WE find much that is appealing in the new theology that is making such headway in England. Its objection to ecclesiastical labels; its belief in the essential oneness of God and man, sharply differentiating from the Unitarian theory which makes a great gulf between God and man; its refusal to admit any essential distinction between humanity and the Deity; its insistence that all men are divine, although in a lesser degree than Jesus Christ; its treatment of the Bible as literature, "a unique record of religious experience," instead of as a fount of dogma; its rejection of the common interpretation of atonement, which makes one suffer for another's fault; and, finally, its basing belief in the immortality of the soul only on the ground that every individual consciousness is a ray of the universal consciousness and cannot be destroyed—all these are tenets of our own faith.

But one basic principle of the old theology retained by the new we must reject absolutely. We do not believe that God is omnipotent. To our mind, the name or word, "God," stands for the infinite reality which is the source of all things, but is itself still in process of fulfilment, in a manner which is suggestively adumbrated in the evolution of humanity. The insistence of all sects that God really is all-powerful has done more to retard the progress of true religion, to create doubts and misgivings and to check moral and spiritual development than all other false teachings combined. How many thousands, perhaps millions, have been driven from the church, from ideals, from uplifting to down-bearing associations, by the hideous picture of such a Being threatening to visit eternal punishment upon all who do not visibly fear and tremble before Him, instead of letting them live their lives with such clear conscience as they might,

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

manfully willing to abide the consequences of a fair balancing of their good and evil deeds—as worthy creatures of a noble Maker! How many sincere beliefs have been shattered and how many pure hearts have been broken by instances seeming to prove that, if He is omnipotent, He must be indeed a jealous God, revelling in practices wantonly cruel! What answer, other than the futile expression of inability to fathom the inscrutable ways of Providence, has ever been, or ever can be, made to the infidel's pertinent query, If your God be all-powerful and true and kind, why does He permit sin and suffering to sadden countless generations of His children who wish to revere and love Him? What possible motive can induce service of such a God except the very cowardice and fear which must be in His own eyes the most contemptible attributes of humankind?

How quickly, on the other hand, are all doubts resolved, how readily are all questions answered, when once admission is made that, lacking complete potency, He, too, is striving against the forces of evil, and that He seeks the cooperation of His children instead of demanding their abasement! What inspiration in the call of such a God—of a partly human God to his partly divine children—as contrasted with the irresistible despair attending the hateful threats of a God whom we have been taught, not to love, but to fear—lest we perish!

THURSDAY, *January 24.* Great Britain, Japan and the United States.

THERE was never for a moment a possibility that the surly and ungracious act of a pompous British Colonial Governor would give rise to any feeling in this country other than one of disgust at the stupidity of an individual; and yet the first impression that prompt repudiation by the enlightened Liberal Government would tend happily to yet more sympathetic relationship between the two peoples seems likely to fall short of realization. A dispassionate study of the effects of the incident only confirms the judgment we have often expressed that, while the educated middle class of English society is distinctly friendly to Americans, whose liking for democratic government they find congenial, the selfish and arrogant aristocracy, represented in politics by the Conservative party, is as completely dominated by a spirit of envy and contempt to-day as it was in the days of George the Third. We have not the slightest doubt, in point of fact, that the real opinion

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

of this class was accurately represented by the Tory journal which frankly "applauded" the "firmness with which Governor Swettenham asserted the rights of his sovereign and flag in a position of peculiar difficulty"; nor do we question the perspicacity of Mr. Waldorf Astor, in his constant quest of aristocratic favor, in permitting his Pall Mall journal to declare that the Governor "took the only possible course open to an official whose duty required him to consider, not only the special relations of his province, but vital questions of international law."

It remained, however, for the organ of the late Lord Salisbury to evolve the more direful suspicion of Americans "bearing gifts." Jamaica, it suggested darkly, was a prize for any naval Power which might choose to overcome its tiny garrison; and "to obtain such a port of vantage when the Panama Canal is open, there are Governments which would incur great risks, not shrinking even from the charge of perfidy." Inasmuch as the Monroe Doctrine definitely forbids such aggression by another Power, there remains no question of the identity of the Government suspected of perfidious intent. Time was, as the "New York Times" sagely observes, when our tender sensibilities would have been rasped by this suggestion, but our official performances in Panama were of such a character and so recent, comparatively, that it is probably well to heed a well-remembered injunction and "tread softly."

The same Tory journal takes up our recent suggestion that England's professions of friendliness would ring more truly if uncontaminated by her pledge to join Japan in waging war upon any nation with which the latter might become involved, and sternly closes the loophole afforded by a hint of the difference between a treaty obligation and compliance therewith under all circumstances. "It is not in this spirit," says the "Standard," "that Great Britain deals with its solemn engagements. For good or for evil, it will stand to its plighted word, and abide by the consequences. As to its attitude towards its ally in the Far East, there cannot be room for doubt or hesitation. Not even the immeasurable advantages of a cordial friendship with our kinsmen in the United States would be weighed against the dishonor of breaking a national pledge."

In what spirit other than this England dealt with the similar "solemn engagement" between Charles II and Louis XIV to

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

make war on Holland, we confess inability to determine; but we make little of awkward precedents ourselves and exact even less regard for them from others. It is the present condition, regardless of theory or possibility of evasion, that Americans will begin to consider as soon as their Chief Magistrate vouchsafes to them a moment for reflection. And that condition was the outcome of no convention in which we participated, but ensued from a political idiosyncrasy which for the time induced England to believe that she had more to fear from Russia than from Japan. Having, from mere isolation, been spared the necessity of considering political exigencies of this nature, we surely may claim exemption from the attendant and inevitable folly of that close association with alien races which already has become so poignant as to threaten the autonomy of the British Empire, in respect, at least, to the fidelity of her Colonies. Our racial difficulties are trying enough, and sufficiently obvious to evoke derisive comment from our transatlantic relatives; but, in point of fact, they are no whit more serious than those of our kinsmen across the sea, whose very national existence beyond the confines of their dominating isles is dependent upon their ability to solve a precisely similar problem.

If, then, this condition be admitted, as surely it must be by all English intellects except those besotted by ignorance or arrogance, the obvious necessity of the time among Anglo-Saxons is that cooperation which can be found only in freedom from unnatural alliances that seem to be entangling. Frankly, we do not believe for a moment that a militant demonstration of the cocksureness of Japan against this country would fetch down upon us the armed forces of Great Britain; but, as we have pointed out regretfully, and as the Tory representative with characteristic obtuseness insists, the solemn treaty obligation now existing surely does contain that very menace. Journals of keener vision, especially in Scotland and Ireland, perceive the situation more clearly than the obdurate supporter of a Swettenham.

The "Aberdeen Free Press" says:

"A heavy task is imposed upon Mr. Bryce by THE NORTH AMERICAN REVIEW. This well-informed and influential fortnightly throws genial banter on the idea that the Ambassador required was one capable of participating with President Roosevelt in the strenuous joys of physical existence. It has been suggested that Sir Mortimer Durand failed to

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

develop the friendship of the two countries because he did not play tennis on the White House courts. THE NORTH AMERICAN REVIEW takes a graver tone on the subject, and declares that friendly professions are incompatible with our treaty obligations to make war with Japan against any Power which menaces her special interests. It is feared that the Japanese claim respecting the equal rights of her students in San Francisco may be included within these interests. Anyhow, THE NORTH AMERICAN REVIEW says that, if we are to convince the United States of the sincerity of our professions of friendship, we must lose no time in attempting to modify the treaty so as to limit it to the case of Continental aggression. Continuance in the present position will, it adds, soon come to be regarded in the States as a wilful and serious menace to their security and welfare. To remove this feeling, Mr. Bryce will devote his heart and brain. It appears unreasonable, but is none the less likely to be adhered to tenaciously."

The Dublin "Freeman's Journal" says:

"When Mr. John Morley alone, or almost alone among leading public men in this country, strongly criticised the policy of the Anglo-Japanese Agreement, he showed both foresight and courage. The maintenance of good relations between England and the United States is professed to be one of their first objects by leaders of both English parties. These professions are now about to be tried by a severe test. THE NORTH AMERICAN REVIEW, which may be taken as more or less inspired in this regard, says that if England really wants to prove her friendship with the United States she must not hesitate about denouncing certain portions of the Treaty. When Mr. Bryce gets to Washington, he will find that this question will become increasingly pressing, and it will be interesting to note how he deals with it. The Treaty was concluded at the time when the late Government was in a state of panic after the disastrous experiences of the South African War. Its immediate purpose was served when it enabled Japan to crush the Russian fleet without interference, to get control of Korea and the mastery of China. The supporters of the Treaty are now realizing that Japan is an infinitely more dangerous and insidious enemy in the Far East than Russia ever could have been. They are not now such enthusiastic pro-Japanese as they were when Japan was slaughtering the giant that they had stood so long in deadly terror of."

The "Leeds Mercury" says:

"There seems to be no doubt that, in the event of hostilities between Japan and the United States, the text of the Anglo-Japanese Treaty, concluded in 1905, would bind Great Britain to make common war upon America. This eventuality was assuredly never contemplated when Lord Lansdowne, the Conservative Minister for Foreign Affairs, entered into a Treaty intended to apply to Central and Eastern Asia. With eyes intently fixed on India, our far-seeing statesman overlooked Canada and the United States. The Treaty recalls the famous Bull of

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Pope Alexander, which, after the first voyage of Columbus, assigned to Spain all discoveries of land west of the sixtieth circle of longitude."

That the enlightened Ambassador, James Bryce, already so deservedly popular in this country, will readily do as much as can be done to allay the growing distrust of English sincerity, may be regarded as certain. But parsnips are not buttered in that way. The solemn covenant of a great Power cannot be ignored or explained away. We repeat that, so long as Great Britain remains bound by treaty to place her armed forces at the disposal of Japan in the deplorable contingency of that nation becoming involved in warfare with the United States, the friendly professions of our cousins will be accepted with the qualification of a certain reserve—and Germany will find the door to our favor opening more widely every day. We perhaps should add, in emulation of our distinguished Secretary of State, that this is said in no threatening sense; it is a mere statement of fact which may suggest a friendly warning.

FRIDAY, *January 25.* Woman Suffrage in Great Britain.

THAT women will vote at the next general election in Great Britain may now be accepted as a virtual certainty. The leaders of the two great parties, Sir Henry Campbell-Bannerman and Mr. Arthur Balfour, along with more than four hundred of the six hundred and seventy members of Parliament, have definitely pledged their support of the Enfranchisement Bill introduced by Mr. Keir Hardie, leader of the Labor party, which is a unit in its favor. Of the two hundred members who have not given positive pledges, it is said with apparent authority that not more than fifty would vote against the bill if action could be had now. Unfortunately, the custom of British Governments forbids the consideration of franchise questions until a final session, on the ground that, if the electorate be enlarged, Parliament must dissolve forthwith in order to give the new constituency immediate voice. If, as seems likely, the present Parliament shall run its full course, six years will elapse before the bill can be passed; but the sentiment is now so nearly unanimous that only an extraordinary change in public opinion, as well as in the disposition of the members, can prevent its ultimate enactment. It is by no means clear that the recent energetic action of the agitators, followed by their arrest and imprisonment, has resulted

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

in the damage to the cause anticipated by many who feared the possible effect of ridicule. The famous novelist, George Meredith, was convinced from the beginning that demonstration to the verge of violence afforded the only way to arouse the English mind, and he wrote bluntly:

"The mistake of the women has been to suppose that John Bull will move sensibly for a solitary kick. It makes him more stubborn, and such a form of remonstrance alienates the decorous among the sisterhood, otherwise not adverse to the emancipation of the sex. It cannot be repeated if the agitating women are to have the backing of their sober sisters, yet it is only by the repetition of this manner of enlivening him that John Bull—a still unburied old gentleman, though not much alive—can be persuaded to move at all."

Members of the House itself hold similar views. One of the most influential, Mr. Philip Snowden, expresses confidence that the suffrage will be extended during the lifetime of the present Government, "but how soon depends entirely on the persistency of the exertions of the agitators." Directness and simplicity characterized the creed of these successful crusaders, thus:

"We demand our immediate enfranchisement on the same terms as men:

"(1) Because we have, by long and painful experience, proved the absolute impossibility of securing any further redress of the many legal wrongs from which we still suffer, and because we fully realize the great danger of further careless, mischievous and unjust legislation, gravely imperilling the well-being of women.

"(2) Because the equal citizenship of women is essential to the growth and development in men of the sense of social and political justice.

"(3) Because the enfranchisement of the women of Great Britain and Ireland will hasten the enfranchisement of the women of all civilized nations, and will thus lead to the development of a higher social and political morality all the world over."

The most popular expression developed in the campaign was that of Mr. Frederick Thoresby to the effect that:

"Man alone may be expected to secure from a merely physical and individualistic standpoint the survival of the *fit*, but if woman is taken into partnership in the management of our every-day world, all that she stands for, namely, purity, sweetness and gentleness, will insure, in our upward struggle, the survival of the *best*."

—which also seems worthy of commemoration.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

SATURDAY, *January 26.* Untruths Respecting Child Labor.

WISE persons always make allowance for overstatement on the part of zealous advocates of a good cause, but the shrewdest of us may be deceived occasionally if the exaggeration be sufficiently gross. Not long ago, in considering the proposal to apply the Interstate Commerce Act to the evil of child labor, we presented certain conclusions based upon figures gleaned from census statistics by the secretary of the national committee which was formed to accomplish reforms and has enlisted the powerful aid of the President and other great-hearted citizens. The presentment was, indeed, as we remarked, startling, showing, in the words of the secretary, that "out of a total of 9,613,252 children in 1900, there were 1,750,178, or 18.2 per cent., at work; while, out of a total of 6,649,483 children in 1880, 1,118,356, or 16.8 per cent., were at work." Technically, we find this statement to be accurate; it is the truth, but so far from the whole truth as to create an utterly false impression. The committee, for example, raises no objection to the employment in factories of children who have reached the age of fourteen, and none whatever to the employment of children in agricultural pursuits, for the reason that their occupation is healthful and under the personal direction of their parents. Of those comprised in the first class there are 501,844, and in the second no less than 1,061,971. Deduct the sum of these two sections considered exempt, and the grand total of 1,750,178 shrinks immediately to 186,363—a sufficiently large number to call for attention, to be sure, but vastly different as the basis of a demand for interference by the Federal Government.

MONDAY, *January 28.* Why Bachelors Should Not be Taxed.

To insist, as some do, that if spinsters be taxed bachelors likewise should be compelled to contribute to the general fund is to our mind absurd. The two classes are quite distinct. As we have noted hitherto, any woman may marry if she will; but it often happens that the only lady who appears sufficiently pleasing in the eyes of a man obstinately refuses to mate with him. The one condition, therefore, is in a broad sense voluntary, while the other is unavoidable and, of course, not properly punishable. In the old days, it is true, the unmarried man was considered fit prey for the tax-gatherer. Ancient Sparta, indeed, treated celi-

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

bacy as a crime of a minor nature, such as we would term a "misdemeanor." Rome was less brutal, but Julius Cæsar discriminated shockingly against bachelors in the allotment of the Campanian lands, and a law was enacted, under Augustus, forbidding an unmarried man under sixty to accept a legacy. The purpose of Julius plainly was to induce the rearing of large families, as he barred from sharing in the spoils even the fathers of less than three children; and it is probable that the motive of Augustus was similar, since the prohibition against the inheritance of legacies applied also to women under fifty, besides actually compelling a widow to remarry within two years after the decease of her husband in order to secure her portion of his estate.

From time to time, special taxes have been imposed upon single men in Great Britain and Ireland, but only, it was always carefully stated, for the purpose of increasing revenues. In France, on the other hand, fear of depopulation is said to be at the root of the present movement, unsuccessful thus far, to exact toll for celibacy. It will be seen, then, that the actuating causes have varied widely; but, generally speaking, the discrimination has rested upon the Spartan principle that it is the duty to the state of every citizen to rear up legitimate children, although there is room for suspicion that, in some instances, the hen-pecked married men who made the laws felt that bachelors should pay well for happiness that seemed to them exceptional.

Of the forty millions of persons of both sexes of a marriageable age in this country, more than twelve millions remain single. This number seems large enough to justify our Chief Magistrate's recent insistence that, from the view-point of a far-seeing ruler, desirous of providing cadets and midshipmen for a large navy, the indefinite continuance of such a condition is intolerable. Lest he may suddenly direct the various States to enact laws that would bear unduly upon unmarried men or suffer them to be brought under the provisions of the Interstate Commerce Act, along with old maids, we earnestly beseech reflection upon certain facts established by our Federal census. According to the statistics of 1900, for example, the country contained only 1,182,293 widowers, or only 3 per cent. of the entire male population, as against 2,721,564 widows, or 7.3 per cent. of all the females. This surprising disparity surely merits serious consideration. We

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

may not assume, for chivalric reasons, that our delicately nurtured ladies are of tougher fibre and more enduring physical nature than their husbands; hence, we are driven to the conclusion that the hazard of matrimony is vastly greater for men than for women, as is evidenced by the great disparity in the actual fatalities. Moreover, the total of divorced men is only 84,903, or 2 per cent., as against 114,965, or 3 per cent., of divorced women, showing clearly that even after being freed from irksome bonds a comparatively small proportion of men have sufficient strength left to withstand the effect of their previous existence.

That these significant facts do, or should, escape the thoughtful attention of a prudent bachelor is not to be expected; realizing, as he must from a study of the statistics, the comparative paucity of his chances of longevity during the matrimonial period and the virtual certainty of his discouraged spirit wasting away soon after divorce, is he not reasonably warranted in evading, in all seemly ways, the wiles of the spinster, and should he in equity be taxed for so doing? Clearly, it seems to us and we trust it will seem to the President, such a course finds ample justification in the mere instinct of self-preservation, which induces even a soldier to avoid engagements against undue odds.

Having, therefore, as we believe, fully established the rightfulness of discrimination in favor of the bachelor as against the spinster in matters relating to taxation, we regard the advancement of further obvious arguments, based upon the inherent rights of married hostesses in unattached men, as wholly supererogatory. Of the danger of matrimony itself falling into disfavor as an avocation, we frankly have no apprehension; the philosopher, we fear, did not err greatly when he declared that, so long as the race continues human, marriage will be—"like a cage; those birds that are inside desiring to get out, and those that are out wanting to get in."

TUESDAY, *January 29.* **Is Shakespeare Popular?**

IF one were to assert that Shakespeare is an unpopular author, little read, and that the average man has but a slight and intermittent taste for him, one would doubtless be met with flat contradiction. The ever-multiplying editions would be pointed to, and the fact would be cited that every household of pious intent

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

and respectable tendencies supplies itself with Shakespeare immediately after it buys the family Bible. It is incontrovertibly true that every one of average education has been piloted through two or three plays while in the high school; and college graduates can usually claim a bowing acquaintance with two or three plays, *plus* some volume of textual criticism. People in love usually read the balcony scene in "Romeo and Juliet" once or twice. But is this a test of popularity? The great question is, What does the tired man read when he comes home from business, and what does the worn-out mother of the family read when she has time to fold her hands and sit still? And the truthful answer is that he reads the evening paper, and she reads the advertisements in the back of the magazines to see what she *would* buy if only she could pay.

The popular misconceptions of Shakespeare are many and great. As a matter of fact, the early plays are too delicately observant, too full of fancy and the sheer glint of fairyland, to catch the average intelligence; the later plays are simply too difficult to understand. The obscurity of Browning is a fashionable phrase, but the obscurity of Browning is transparent compared with the obscurity of "Troilus and Cressida" or "Timon of Athens."

That it would be a consummation devoutly to be wished that Shakespeare should be popular is unquestionable, but the noblest course in life is to look facts squarely in the face and then shape one's conduct as wisely as one may. And it is futile to concur in the popular fallacy that the average man reads Shakespeare for amusement, because he does not. Tolstoy and Maeterlinck to the contrary notwithstanding, Shakespeare's view of life is still far in advance of that of the mass of mankind, and we still go to him only when we are not too weary to climb the steeps of his thought.

WEDNESDAY, *January 30.* Writers' Writers.

A SUCCESSFUL novelist was recently asked what he read for diversion. He responded: "Plotinus, Jamblichus, Fichte sometimes, or Kant." "And what," asked the baffled questioner, "do you read when you work?" "When I work hardest," the novelist replied, "I read my friends' novels." The intellectual quality of the "best sellers" may have given us an exaggerated idea of the low plane of the public taste, but it is a dangerous rock to rest

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

upon. The public has shown its taste for novels that are worth while, that combine literary skill with profound perceptions, as witness the wide esteem accorded Hardy and Meredith, and the ready acclaim with which Robert Hichens has been greeted.

But, even allowing this, there remain writers who are and very likely always will be writers' writers—writers upon whom other writers batten and grow fat. A writer naturally desires the matter he feeds upon to be stimulative; he has not time for mere padding with commonplace reflection or average observation or matter-of-fact, unilluminative detail. When he reads he wants his page, as it were, highly charged with thought. There are certain writers of whom it is safe to say that they will never belong to the general public. Donne is most notably a poet's poet, as is Landor. The one is too fantastic, too truculent, too profoundly thoughtful; the other too eclectic, too distant, too elegantly refined for "human nature's daily food."

Pater, despite ebullitions of enthusiasm in colleges for his style, will remain ever a novelist's novelist, with his far-removed interests, his poetic conception of life, his detachment from anything like personal desire, his freedom from partisanship or passion. He has removed the whole interest of life from the plane of having to the plane of thinking, and is throughout all his books a quiescent observer of ideals.

The great question is whether, as the army of writers multiply, the number of great writers who feed them will keep up the pace. Fortunately we have many ages and tongues to draw inspiration from; and those writers will stand highest who most resolutely refuse to be drawn into reading the mass of evanescent stuff as it emerges from the press. He, at least, will do well to follow Emerson's advice, and wait till a book is ten years old before reading it.

PRODUCED BY UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED